

# CHURCH HISTORY

Published by  
THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORIANS

# THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

FOUNDED BY HERLEIGH SCHAFY, 1889; REORGANIZED, 1906; INCORPORATED BY ACT OF  
THE LEGISLATURE OF NEW YORK, 1916

## OFFICERS FOR 1941

F. W. BUCKLER	President
E. R. HARTY, Jr.	Vice President
MATTHEW SPIKA	Secretary
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS	Treasurer
JOHN FORTNAWELL	Assistant Secretary

## OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

FREDERICK WILLIAMS LINTHICUM	CHARLES H. LYTLE
JOHN THOMAS McNEELY	ROLAND H. BAINBON
WILLIAM PARK	PERRY V. NEWBOD
HERBERT RAYMOND BENDISSEN	HAROLD S. BENDER
JOHN A. E. HARTMAN	CYRIL G. RICHARDSON

## EDITORIAL BOARD OF CHURCH HISTORY

ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS, Managing Editor  
MATTHEW SPIKA, Editor  
F. W. BUCKLER, ex officio

PUBLICATION OFFICE, BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA

RECEIVING AND CIRCULATION OFFICE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

*Church History* has quarterly issues published in March, June, September, and December by the American Society of Church History. The subscription price of the volume for 1941 is \$3.00. The price of single copies is seventy-five cents. To foreign countries the postage is seventy-five cents a year should be added. Subscriptions should be sent to Professor Matthew Spika, 5157 University Ave., Chicago, 37, or Professor Robert Hastings Nichols, 80 Riverside Ave., New York, N. Y. Remittances should be made to the order of American Society of Church History.

Communications regarding subscriptions, book reviews, and all other matters of editorial nature should be sent to Professor Matthew Spika, 5157 University Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

Change of address notices and changes of address should be addressed to Prof. F. W. Buckler, 30 Chambers Ave., New York, N. Y.

The volume for 1941 was mailed March 2, 1941, at the post office at Birmingham, Alabama, at special rate of March 2, 1941.

# CHURCH HISTORY

## EDITORIAL BOARD

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*

ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS

F. W. BUCKLER, *ex officio*

---

Vol. X

June, 1941

No. 2

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### PART 1

#### THE STRUGGLE FOR RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

*Roland H. Bainton* 95

#### CLASSICAL AND BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP IN THE AGE OF THE RENAISSANCE AND REFORMATION

*Dean P. Lockwood and Roland H. Bainton* 125

#### THE CROMWELLIAN ESTABLISHMENT

*Ethyn W. Kirby* 144

#### JOHN HALES AND THE PURITANS DURING THE MARIAN EXILE

*George T. Peck* 159

#### BOOK REVIEWS: 178

GOODENOUGH, ERWIN R., *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus*

..... Donald W. Riddle

BRAUDE, WILLIAM G., *Jewish Proselyting in the First Five*

*Centuries of the Common Era. The Age of the Tannaim and*

*Amoraim* ..... Donald W. Riddle

## CONTENTS

SPINKA, MATTHEW AND DOWNEY, GLANVILLE, <i>Chronicle of John Malalas, Books VIII-XVIII</i> .....	Peter Charanis
THROOP, PALMER A., <i>Criticism of the Crusades</i> ....	Roland H. Bainton
BURCH, GEORGE BOSWORTH, <i>The Steps of Humility</i> , by Bernard Abbot of Clairvaux .....	S. Harrison Thomson
KNOWLES, DOM DAVID, <i>The Monastic Order in England</i> .....	John T. McNeill
ALTMANN, BERTHOLD, <i>Studies in Medieval German Jewish History</i> .....	Solomon Grayzel
SMITH, CHARLES EDWARD, <i>Papal Enforcement of Some Medieval Marriage Laws</i> .....	W. E. Lunt
FERRARA, ORESTES, <i>The Borgia Pope: Alexander VI</i> , Quirinus Breen	
COFFIN, CHARLES, ed., <i>Ignatius His Conclave</i> , by John Donne .....	Matthew Spinka
TEES, FRANCIS H., <i>The Beginnings of Methodism in England and in America</i> .....	A. W. Nagler
SMYTH, CHARLES, <i>Simeon and Church Order</i> .....	A. C. Zabriskie
LEOPOLD, RICHARD WILLIAM, <i>Robert Dale Owen: a Biography</i> .....	William W. Sweet
WEYER, FRANK E., <i>Presbyterian Colleges and Academies in Nebraska</i> .....	Francis L. Bouquet

## PART 2

LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY	195
---	-----



924  
2. G. Gooch  
3-9-45

## THE STRUGGLE FOR RELIGIOUS LIBERTY<sup>1</sup>

ROLAND H. BAINTON

*Yale Divinity School*

A sketch of the struggle for religious liberty during the course of the last four hundred years will be attempted in this paper. Attention will first be focussed on the theories and factors affecting persecution and tolerance on the part of both Catholics and Protestants. Then the administrative aspects of the subject will be considered alike from the broader standpoint of the structure of the church and of the state and from the more specific angle of the handling of dissent by political authority. Finally brief consideration will be devoted to residual and perennial problems of constraint and freedom.

The age of the Reformation has been taken as our point of departure because this period at once intensified persecution and at the same time opened the door to an ultimate freedom. Let us cast a preliminary glance at the situation as it was in the sixteenth century before proceeding to a consideration of questions of theory.

The Protestant Reformation itself has at times been credited with the rise of religious liberty but such a statement can be made only with distinct reserve. The remark of Gooch that democracy was the child not of the reformers but of the Reformation<sup>2</sup> could be transferred with equal warrant to religious liberty and with equal qualification, for in both cases the outcome was only indirect and eventual. The outstanding reformers of the sixteenth century were in no sense tolerant. Luther in 1529 acquiesced in the death penalty for Anabaptists and Calvin instigated the execution of Servetus while Melancthon applauded. The reformers can be ranged on the side of liberty only if the younger Luther be pitted against the older or the left wing of the Reformation against the right. Consistent liberals, to be sure, there were such as Franck, Castellio, and

<sup>1</sup> The presidential address delivered at the meeting of the Society on December 27, 1940.

<sup>2</sup> G. P. Gooch and Harold Laski, *English Democratic Ideas* (Cambridge, 1927), 7.

Acontius, but they were a small and powerless minority. The opinion of the dominant group was expressed with pithy brutality by Theodore Beza when he stigmatized religious liberty as a most diabolical dogma because it means that everyone should be left to go to hell in his own way.<sup>3</sup>

Neither can one say that the Reformation at the outset brought any gain to liberty. Rather the reverse, for Protestantism arrested secularist tendencies and made religion again the preeminent concern of men for another century and a half. The spirit of persecution was thereby aroused. A latitudinarian Catholicism was stung by the emergence of a formidable rival into a renewal of inquisitorial rigor. The last portion of the sixteenth century in consequence came to differ vastly in temper from the opening decades when even in Spain the Inquisition, having done its work against the Moors and the Jews, appeared to be on the point of discontinuance. The Alumbrados and Erasmians flourished and in Portugal the humanist George Buchanan could actually secure release from the toils of the Holy Office. Protestant heresy trials commenced in Spain in 1552.

In England likewise Sir Thomas More in his Utopian days had toyed with the idea of a world parliament of religious. In Germany Reuchlin to all practical intent had won the battle for the freedom of Semitic studies. In France incendiaries like Farel were harbored by a Bishop Briçonnet and Francis I could oscillate in his policy toward heretics depending on whether he was seeking an alliance with the Lutherans, the pope, or the Turk. How vast was the change under Henry II when not only the Inquisition and the local clergy became active, but even the civil courts organized special tribunals for cases of heresy such as the notorious *Chambre Ardente* in Paris, which in the year 1548-49 made 450 arrests and sent 60 to the stake! In Italy similarly the early years of the century had seen little system, *poca regola*, in ferreting out unbelief, as the liberal Cardinal Morone testified years after when himself under detention.<sup>4</sup> In the first decades Venice refused to close

<sup>3</sup> *Epistolarum Theologicarum Theodori Bezae Vezelij, Liber Unus* (Geneva, 1575), 20. *Est enim hoc mira diabolicum dogma, Sinendum esse unumquemque ut si volet pereat.*

<sup>4</sup> Cesare Cantù, *Gli Eretici d'Italia* (3 vols., Torino, 1865-66), II, 180.

her lagoons to the Lutheran merchants<sup>5</sup> and Naples stoutly resisted the introduction of the Inquisition.<sup>6</sup> The change came here in 1542 with the bull *Licet ab initio*, establishing the Roman Inquisition. Shortly thereafter the implacable Caraffa, the Calvin of the Counter Reformation, became pope as Paul IV and all irenicism between Catholicism and Protestantism was definitely at an end.

Protestantism in the meantime had grown likewise more intransigent as it passed from Lutheranism to Calvinism. The upshot of the conflict between the rival faiths was religious war, first in Switzerland from 1529-31, then in Germany from 1546-47, and in France and Holland commencing in the sixties and continuing throughout the sixteenth century. The seventeenth saw the civil wars in England and the Thirty Years War on the Continent, in both of which religion played no minor rôle. The bitterness became so intense that the Calvinist Frederick V, the exiled Elector of the Palatinate, when offered restoration to his rule on condition that he tolerate Lutherans, flatly refused. We see then that the struggle for religious liberty had to be waged at the same time against the intolerance of a Catholicism menaced by a new foe and of a Protestantism seeking to preserve itself against the Catholic onslaught to the right and sectarian disintegration to the left.

The battle took place primarily in the field of ideas. Religious persecution was religious and only incidentally social and political. The belief that outside of the Church there was no salvation, that heresy damns souls—this was the root of the matter. Protestants and Catholics at this point were agreed, and the differences between their theories of persecution are slight. Lord Acton was quite mistaken in portraying the Protestant theory of persecution as diametrically opposed to the Catholic on the ground that Protestants had nothing left for which to persecute save error, whereas Catholics withstood the disruption of society through dissent.<sup>7</sup> This picture is utterly misleading. Neither Catholic nor Protestant ever

5 Georg Martin Thomas, ed., *Martin Luther und die Reformationsbewegung in Deutschland vom Jahre 1520-32 in Auszügen aus Marino Samuto's Diarien* (Amsbach, 1883), 155. "Quanto alli Lutherani et heretici, el stado e dominio nostro è libero, e perhò non potemo devedarli."

6 Luigi Amabile, *Il Santo Ufficio della Inquisizione in Napoli* (2 vols., Città de Castello, 1892), 1, 120.

7 John Emerich Edward Dalberg-Acton, *History of Freedom* (London, 1922), Chapter V, "The Protestant Theory of Persecution."

persecuted mere error but only obstinate error. Both persecuted heresy as heresy, and both believed that heresy, if unchecked, would disintegrate society. Both were driven by the exigencies of the situation to suppress dissent. That was the theory of *cuius regio eius religio*, which conceded to princes of rival faiths the right to establish each his own religion and to expel dissenters; and the Anglican settlement was based precisely on latitude toward error and severity toward non-conformity.

A few differences there are between the Catholic and Protestant theories, but they are not great and they make in diverse directions. Luther took a faltering step toward liberty when he made the object of suppression not heresy but blasphemy. The actual gain in his own practice, however, was nil because he simply treated heresy as blasphemy. Calvin declined to avail himself of this subterfuge and burned Servetus outright as a heretic.<sup>8</sup> At several points Calvin intensified the Catholic theory of persecution; first by accentuating the feudal conception of sin, according to which the enormity of an offense depends on the rank of the person against whom it is committed. When then God was exalted by Calvin to a dizzy transcendental eminence, heresy as an insult to His majesty became a crime of infinite depravity. In consequence the Catholic proviso that only a relapsed heretic should be put to death was abandoned. On no pretext could Servetus be regarded as relapsed. The other great difference was that the doctrine of predestination necessarily altered the purpose of persecution which could not be to save souls since they were saved or damned already but could only be for the glory of God. Of this more later.

The greatest difference lay in the legal basis for persecution. For Catholics this was the canon law which was jettisoned by the Protestants. For it were substituted the Bible and the Roman law. In the long run this shift made for liberty, because the Bible provides but an insecure basis for the persecution of heresy, and the Roman law, while explicit enough, was to enjoy only a temporary vogue. The difficulty in the case of the Bible is that although the Old Testament is severe in its penalties, they are directed not against heresy but only against

<sup>8</sup> George L. Burr, "Anent the Middle Ages," *American Historical Review*, XVIII (1913), 721-22.

idolatry and apostasy, whereas the New Testament, though mentioning heresy, is mild in its treatment of the offender. The Protestant persecutors had to combine the offense of the New with the penalty of the Old Covenant, a combination which the liberals were not slow in prying apart.

The Roman law was more explicit both with regard to the offense and the penalty.<sup>9</sup> The two heresies singled out for especial opprobrium in the *Codex Justinianus* are a denial of the Trinity and a repetition of baptism. The former offense is menaced with dire though unspecified penalty, the second is proscribed by death. This ancient legislation directed against Arians and Donatists was revived in the sixteenth century and applied to Antitrinitarians and Anabaptists. Luther, Melanchthon, and Calvin all appealed to the imperial law. Joris, Gentile, and Servetus, and the Anabaptists as a whole, suffered under its terms. In fact the very name Anabaptist, meaning Re-Baptizer, was invented in order to subject to the imperial laws those who preferred to call themselves simply Baptists. They would never admit that they baptized over again, for infant baptism was to them no baptism, but rather a "washing in the Roman bath." The prevalence of the imperial code goes far to explain why Antitrinitarianism and Anabaptism were the two heresies visited with the severest penalties in the sixteenth century. Significantly, the last infliction of the death penalty for heresy in England under James I was for just these offenses. Roman law, however, was destined to succumb in favor of national codes and a policy of persecution resting on no deeper legal basis than the old imperial laws could not indefinitely survive.

Differences, then, there are between the Catholic and Protestant theories of persecution but they are comparatively trivial. When one turns to the theory of liberty the case is different, for Protestantism can be tolerant on more grounds than Catholicism, which cannot relinquish so many of the requisites for persecution. Of these there are three: 1) the

<sup>9</sup> *Codex Justinianus* I, I: *De Summa Trinitate* = *Codex Theodosianus* XVI, 1, 2. *Codex Justinianus* I, 6, 2, *Ne Sanctum baptismum iteretur* = *Codex Theodosianus* XVI, 6, 6.

Cf. George L. Burr, "Liberals and Liberty," *Proceedings of the Unitarian Historical Society*, II (1933), part 2.

I have discussed the matter in my article on Luther (see the bibliography at the close of this article), 139-140 and again in my "David Joris," *Archiv für Reformationgeschichte*, Ergänzungsband VI (Leipzig, 1935), 11.



persecutor must believe that he is right; 2) that the point in question is important; 3) that coercion will be effective. Catholicism can relax only on the third of these conditions, but Protestantism on all three.

The Catholic can never admit any uncertainty with regard to the cardinal affirmations of the church. Neither can he concede that a wilful denial of an article in the ecumenical creeds is a venial offense, since it will certainly entail damnation. The only ground for tolerance is expediency; but this is a larger ground than the word at first connotes, for expediency may be ecclesiastical, political, or religious. The church can argue from the ecclesiastical point of view that persecution will recoil upon Catholics and do the church more harm than good. This is the situation in the United States. If any church had been established it would not have been the Catholic and if any churches were persecuted the Catholic would not have been exempt. Leading American Catholics have clearly recognized this situation and for that reason have whole-heartedly endorsed the American system of toleration. Archbishop Ireland, speaking in 1913, declared:

Would we alter if we could the constitution in regard to its treatment of religion, the principles of Americanism in regard to religious freedom? I answer with an emphatic no. . . . Violate religious freedom against Catholics: our swords are at once unsheathed. Violate it in favor of Catholics against non-Catholics: no less readily do they leap from the scabbard.<sup>10</sup>

In similar phrase, Cardinal Gibbons declared:

American Catholics rejoice in our separation of church and state, and I can conceive of no combination of circumstances likely to arise which would make a union desirable to either church or state. . . . Other countries, other manners. . . . For ourselves we thank God we live in America. . . . The question arises, which is the best arrangement, the official union of church and state or the mutual independence of both? I have nothing to say in regard to other countries, but our own friendly relation of church and state without official union is best for us.<sup>11</sup>

Again expediency may be conceived in political terms. Persecution is then regarded as indiscreet because it wrecks the state. Here is the program of the *Politiques*. As a Catholic, Henry IV promulgated the Edict of Nantes and as a Catholic, Joseph II established the Decree of 1781. He was actuated by

10 Cited from the speech of August 11, 1913 in John Augustine Ryan and Moorhouse F. X. Millar, *The State and the Church* (New York, 1922).

11 Allen Sinclair Will, *Life of Cardinal Gibbons* (New York, 1922), collects these and other passages in I, chapter XVII.

distress over the improverishment and depopulation of the land through the expulsion of wealthy Protestants. As a corrective, toleration was granted openly to Lutherans and Calvinists and tacitly to Hussites, but not to Deists who presumably mattered less.<sup>12</sup>

Finally expediency may be religious. From this point of view persecution is ineffective because incapable of engendering that heartfelt adherence which alone the Church can regard as adequate. Such a feeling I strongly suspect lies behind the repeal in the latest edition of the canon law<sup>13</sup> of every penalty for heresy save excommunication. The preface of Cardinal Gasparri's edition declares that the sources of the present provisions will be found in the notes, but agreement between the text and authorities need not be expected. The discrepancy will be particularly marked in the section on penalties. Then one turns back to the penalties for heresy and discovers that all of the frightful stipulations by which the Inquisition was supported are relegated to the bottom of the page. Protestants expiate the intolerance of their forbears by expiatory monuments, Catholics by footnotes.

In saying, however, that Catholics can be tolerant only on grounds of expediency one must not forget that Catholicism has nurtured three movements which made for tolerance, especially when transferred to Protestant soil. Namely mysticism, humanism, and sectarianism. Mysticism contributes by diverting attention from dogma to experience and by equating the way to God with the way of suffering which comports more readily with martyrdom than with persecution. Humanism demands freedom for investigation in a limited area, and sectarianism, as in the case of the Spiritual Franciscans, places obedience to God or to the founder of the order, or to the Holy Spirit, above obedience to the pope. Such movements, to be sure, were restricted or suppressed by Catholicism, but none the less served in a measure to check dogmatic intolerance within Catholicism and proved a powerful solvent when transmitted to the Reformation.

Protestantism has made for liberty in much more varied ways, because it has been able to attenuate all three reasons

<sup>12</sup> Hermann Meynert, *Kaiser Josef II* (Vienna, 1862).

<sup>13</sup> *Codex Iuris Canonici* (Rome, 1919), Praefatio xlii-xliii and Lib. V, Pars iii, Tit. xi.

for persecution. Certitude with regard even to the most cardinal doctrines and with regard to the authority of the Church and the Bible has wavered in the face of attack on Protestant soil. And this despite the fact that Protestantism at first produced a more audacious theory of knowledge than that ever claimed by Catholics. Calvin, by basing religious certitude on Scripture confirmed by the testimony of the Holy Spirit, brought the assurance of the medieval Augustinians to its apex and went beyond them in equating faith with knowledge.<sup>14</sup> Against this citadel of certainty the attack was launched from the Protestant ranks, notably by Sebastian Castellio, who like Aquinas differentiated knowledge and faith, assigning to the latter a lower grade of certainty. His own theory of religious knowledge was derived from the Stoic epistemology of Cicero for whom knowledge is derived only from sense experience and reason.<sup>15</sup> To this the Christian added revelation as contained in the Bible, itself in turn subject to reason which practically takes the place of the *testimonium Spiritus Sancti*, and the "reason" in question is not that of a close-knit intellectual system after the manner of Aquinas but is rather akin to common sense. This sort of rationalism was to run through Locke and the Deists until shipwrecked on the skepticism of Hume, but in the meantime such tenets as the Trinity, the real presence, and biblical miracles had been irreparably damaged.

The second prerequisite for persecution, that the point in question be regarded as important, was demolished in part by a shift of interest within the realm of religion itself and in part by a secularism which diverted attention from religion as a whole. We shall look at both approaches, though only the former is relevant to a discussion of Protestant attitudes.

Within the sphere of religion the importance of the dogmas supported by the sword of the magistrate was minimized in favor of the mystical and ethical elements. The one elevated inner experience, the other right conduct as more significant than correct opinions. In Protestantism the ethical attack was

14 *Instit.* III, ii, 2-14, *Cal. Op.* II, 399-410. Cf. Peter Brunner, *Vom Glauben bei Calvin* (Tübingen, 1925), and Karl Heim, *Das Gewissheitsproblem in der systematischen Theologie bis zu Schleiermacher* (Leipzig, 1911).

15 Castellio's *De Arte Dubitandi* was published by Elizabeth Feist (Hirsch) in *Per la Storia degli Eretici Italiani*, Reale Accademia d'Italia (Rome, 1937). Cicero's views are found in his reply to the Academics, *Lucullus* II, 7. Cf. Ludwig Stein, *Die Erkenntnislehre der Stoa* (Berlin, 1888).

the more prevalent. The argument was that in the eyes of God deeds count for more than creeds and creeds themselves must be subject to ethical tests. Just as the medical theories are judged by the cures which they effect so too must theological affirmations be evaluated in terms of the correction of sins. Creeds are even ethically conditioned, for correctness of opinion is valueless apart from sincerity of conviction. From this position the step was easy to the assertion that sincerity is to be esteemed even though the opinions held be incorrect. The reason why Castellio was so incensed over the execution of Servetus was that the victim, however mistaken, could not be accused of insincerity and died precisely because of a staunch avowal of those convictions by the denial of which he might have been saved. Here then we have an enunciation of the rights of error as a stage in the quest for truth. Error is not the goal, but honest error is nearer to the truth of religion than dishonest correctness.<sup>16</sup>

On this basis alone does conscience acquire any rights. The dominant reformers of the sixteenth century scoffed at any conscience save a right conscience. *Conscientia*, they claimed, means nothing apart from *Scientia*; *Gewissen* must be based on *Wissen*. Heretics have only a fictitious conscience. One recalls how Knox scoffed at Queen Mary's appeal to her conscience. The plea for conscience becomes relevant only when moral integrity is prized above dogmatic impeccability.<sup>17</sup>

Another way of minimizing the importance of the points over which persecution raged was to make a distinction between one dogma and another. In this way fundamentalism arose. It was an attempt to segregate the fundamentals from the non-essentials in the interests of liberty. This type of thought has a long history. The *Devotio Moderna* had deprecated theological speculation to the point that Wessel Gansfort declared no ampler theology necessary for salvation than that of the penitent thief who was admitted to Paradise on very minimal terms.<sup>18</sup> In the same vein Erasmus upbraided those

16 See my article on Castellio in the Burr *Festschrift* listed in the bibliography at the close of this article.

17 This question is well handled by Johannes Kühn, *Toleranz und Offenbarung* (Leipzig, 1923), and again by Heinrich Hoffman, *Reformation und Gewissensfreiheit* (Giessen, 1932).

18 E. W. Miller and J. W. Seudder, *Wessel Gansfort, American Society of Church History Papers* (2 vols., New York, 1917), II, 101-102.

who dissipated their energies on arid trivialities. The mediators between the Lutherans and Zwinglians relegated the sacramentarian controversy to the periphery.<sup>19</sup> Castellio consigned the Trinity and predestination to the non-essentials because the publicans were saved in ignorance of these tenets. This line of thought was definitely formulated by Acontius who reduced the creedal issues to those points distinctly stated in Scripture as both necessary and necessary to be known for salvation. The fundamentals then boiled down to two points: belief in Christ as the Son of God and in justification by faith alone. The first requirement would exclude the Sabellians, with whom perhaps some Antitrinitarians of the sixteenth century might have been identified; the second ruled out the Catholics. The only penalty was excommunication.<sup>20</sup>

An obscure Lutheran theologian, Petrus Meiderlinus, gave to the program of Acontius a formulation which became the classic slogan of English latitudinarianism. *In necessariis unitas, in non necessariis libertas, in omnibus caritas.*<sup>21</sup> Locke summed up a long tradition when he compared religious controversies to complaints that a pilgrim to the heavenly Jerusalem was not equipped with buskins, ate meat on the journey, avoided bypaths and the company of those who appeared to him unduly frivolous or austere, and attached himself to a guide clad or not clad in white and crowned with a mitre. These of course are non-essentials which "breed implacable enmities among Christian brethren who are all agreed in the substantial and truly fundamental part of religion."<sup>22</sup>

This approach, however, had its limitations and pitfalls. So long as there were any fundamentals some one was always left out, and the penalty might well exceed excommunication.

19 Walther Koehler, *Die Geistesansichten des Acontius*, Festschrift für Karl Müller (Tübingen, 1922).

20 *Jacobii Acontii Satanae Stratagematum libri octo*, ed. Walther Koehler (München, 1927). On the essentials, 58 f; on the specific requirements, 186-187; on the exclusion of Sabellians, 69, 244-246; on Catholics, 109, 183, 185, 187, 188. There is now an English translation by Charles O'Malley, *Satan's Stratagems*, (2 vols., Sutro Branch, California State Library, San Francisco, English Series, May, 1940), V, 2.

21 A. Eekhof, *De Zinspreuk In necessariis unitas . . .* (Leiden, 1931). Meiderlinus was known to Baxter under the pseudonym *Eupertus Meldenius*. Karl von Müller in his *Kirchengeschichte*, II<sup>2</sup>, traced the thread of what he called the *Acontiusgeist* through Dutch and English thought in the seventeenth century. He well points out that Laud might have been in this tradition (p. 460).

22 *Works*, III, 15 (London, n. d.).



Or if this possibility were excluded by reducing the fundamentals to practically nothing, what then became of Christianity as a religion? The Enlightenment left very little.

Furthermore the distinction between the essentials and non-essentials readily became a boomerang. The established church and the government could very well argue that the individual subject ought not to be a stickler for points which by common consent do not imperil salvation. In such matters let him relinquish his preferences in the interest of seemliness and public order. The argument was succinctly put by Agricola in defense of the Augsburg Interim.

Inasmuch as the Interim, thank God, includes the main points of the Christian teaching and religion, the Elector of Brandenburg does not know what better advice he can give than that everyone is obligated to obey the emperor. . . . No one has reason to say that he is not at liberty to hold the true faith, since the essentials of the true religion are freely conceded. In ceremonies and outward practices every one is bound to obey the government. . . . This serves public order and does not infringe upon liberty. One is not saved if one does these things, nor damned if one does not. Therefore the regulation of such matters belongs to the government.<sup>23</sup>

Just the same type of reasoning was employed in defense of the Anglican settlement. Said Whitgift in his reply to Cartwright: "In things indifferent private men's wills are subject to such as have authority over them; and therefore they ought to consent to their determination in such matters, except they will show themselves wilful; which is a great fault and deserving to be punished."<sup>24</sup>

This was again the position of Laud. In matters of doctrine he was a latitudinarian, loath even to formulate the fundamentals, "for to whomsoever God hath given more, of him shall more be required." The only doctrinal requirement which he could discover in Scripture was belief that "God is and that he is a rewarder of them that seek Him" (Heb. 1:6). The line should not be drawn so narrowly as to shut even the meanest Christian out of heaven.<sup>25</sup> But that is no reason why he should not be shut out of the Church of England, if he will not do what he is commanded in matters not imperilling salvation. Because the church may be wrong it does not follow

<sup>23</sup> See my *Castellio's Concerning Heretics*, 64.

<sup>24</sup> *Works*, Parker Society (1852), II, 571.

<sup>25</sup> *Works*, II, 402-403.

that she is not to be obeyed.<sup>26</sup> Laud thus combined latitude in dogma with rigidity in discipline as to the adiaphora.

Jeremy Taylor had the same program and is not to be regarded as basically more tolerant than Laud because he was spared the onus of carrying it out. Said Taylor, "A man may be a good Christian though he believe an error not fundamental. Nevertheless his opinion may accidentally disturb the public peace. In that case he is to be dealt with."<sup>27</sup> The distinction between fundamentals and non-essentials having thus become a tool of repression, some of the champions of liberty in the seventeenth century pronounced the whole concept unworkable since the Protestant sects were divided as to the fundamentals and the magistrate was not in a position to decide.<sup>28</sup>

Thus far we have been moving in the religious sphere in considering the ways in which the importance was minimized of the grounds for persecution. At the same time non-religious factors were operative for protestants and Catholics alike. The economic factor affected the reluctance already noticed of Venice to close her lagoons to the Lutheran heretics. The *Fondaco dei Tedeschi* was too profitable an institution to suppress. William of Orange protested that the banishment from Holland of a "vast of Reformers, even if it be carried out without resorting to force, would strip the country of its best workers and chief traders—our country which is 'the market of Christendom.'"<sup>29</sup>

His advice in the end was taken and the example of Holland was not lost upon England. Roger Williams pointed out that there had descended upon Holland a "confluence of the persecuted" which drew "boats, drew trade, drew shipping, and that so mightily in so short a time that shipping, trading, wealth, greatness, and honor . . . have appeared to fall as out of heaven in a crown of garland upon the head of this poor fisher town."<sup>30</sup>

Another historical example was cited by Henry Robinson,

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 286-287.

<sup>27</sup> *Liberty of Prophesying*, XVI, 4.

<sup>28</sup> John Owen, *Works* (London, 1851), VIII, 198. (Tract of 1649). Robert Greville asserted that nothing is indifferent. William Haller, *Tracts on Liberty* (New York, 1934), II, 57.

<sup>29</sup> Frederic Harrison, *William the Silent* (New York, 1924), 68-69.

<sup>30</sup> The bloody tenent yet more bloody, *Publ. Narragansett Club*, IV (1870), 9. Cf. Jordan, III, 503.

namely the great economic gain to Turks and Barbary pirates in the expulsion of Moors and Jews from Spain and equal detriment to Christendom. "Oh let not the like befall England with her manufacturers."<sup>31</sup> Early in the reign of James, the Baptist Leonard Busher reminded him of the "great benefit and commodity which would redound to your majesty and to all your subjects . . . by the great commerce, in trade and traffic, both of Jews and all people; which now, for want of liberty of conscience, are forced and driven elsewhere."<sup>32</sup> In our own land the last straw which broke the back of the establishment in Massachusetts was the industrialization of the state and the consequent need for cheap labor which at that moment happened to be Irish Catholic.<sup>33</sup>

In this connection, too, may be mentioned economic imperialism. The Hohenzollerns facilitated annexations of territory by demanding no religious changes on the part of newly acquired subjects. In England Harrington commended British imperialism as a religious duty in order to provide a "sanctuary of the afflicted" for "oppressed peoples." If the question is raised "whether it be lawful for a commonwealth to aspire to the empire of the world, it is to ask whether it be lawful for it to do its duty, or to put the world into a better condition than it was before." Divine aid in such an enterprise can be confidently assumed, "for if the cause of mankind be the cause of God, the Lord of Hosts will be your Captain and you shall be a praise to the whole earth."<sup>34</sup>

Nationalism again eclipsed religion for those who came to feel that the unity and security of the nation were of more importance than the victory of a single religion. To this party in France was given the appropriate title of the *Politiques*. Their leader, Michel de l'Hôpital, was grieved to see his beloved France ravaged by Spanish and Italian mercenaries in the pay of the Catholics, or English and German mercenaries in

31 "Liberty of Conscience," 1643, facsimile, Haller, *Tracts*, III, 123; reprint in *Temple of Religion and Tower of Peace*, Sutro Branch, Cal. State Library (July, 1940), 89.

32 *Religion's Peace* (1614), reprinted from the edition of 1646 in *Tracts on Liberty of Conscience*, Hanserd Knollys Soc. (London, 1846), 62.

33 Joseph Francis Thorning, *Religious Liberty in Transition* (Diss., Washington D. C., 1931), 83.

34 *Oceana*, 199-200 in the 3rd ed., of John Toland (London, 1737), but 193-194 in the edition of S. B. Liljegren, *James Harrington's Oceana*, Skrifter utgivna av Vetenskaps-Societeten i Lund IV (1924).

the pay of the Huguenots. Better toleration than desolation.<sup>35</sup> Such considerations induced Henry IV both to embrace Catholicism and at the same time to accord comparative liberty to the Huguenots. Queen Elizabeth in England had a similar outlook. In the American colonies one cannot exactly speak of nationalism as a factor, yet the desire for military security accelerated the toleration of dissident groups. In Virginia where the Anglican Church was established, Huguenots, Germans, and Presbyterians were settled on the frontier "to awe the straggling parties of northern Indians, and be a good barrier for all that country."<sup>36</sup> The Baptists in Virginia first obtained toleration in the army, when the need for a united front against England in 1775 led to a concession to dissenting ministers to exhort and celebrate worship for "scrupulous consciences" among the recruits.<sup>37</sup>

At the same time internationalism deliberately diverted attention from religious controversies in order to secure a stable ground for the relations of the new national states. After the collapse of the universal church and the universal empire, where could a solid basis for internationalism be discovered? The canon law would not do because it was rejected by Protestants. The Roman law would not do because it was not conceived in terms of international relations. The Bible would not do because both vague and controverted. The answer was discovered by Hugo Grotius in the theory of natural law, but a new kind of natural law it was, no longer identified with the law of God as formulated in the Pentateuch, but secularized and thereby rendered immune to religious division; grounded in experience and nature like Locke's theory of knowledge; valid even if there were no God; accessible to the understanding of the natural man. This type of natural law was not altogether new. Its origins lay in the Nominalism of the late Middle

35 Henri Amphoux, *Michel de L'Hopital et la Liberté de Conscience au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1900). Etienne Pasquier has commonly been regarded as a leader of the *Politiques* because of the attribution to him of the *Exhortation aux princes et seigneurs* of 1561. His authorship is contested by Albert Chamberland, "Etienne Pasquier et l'intolérance religieuse au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine*, I (1899), 38-49, where it is shown that in the genuine works Pasquier regarded two religions in the same place as a "meslange et pesle-mesle et desbauche." The suppression of the Huguenots was, however, limited for him by practical and legal considerations.

36 Henry R. McIlwaine, *The Struggle of Protestant Dissenters for Religious Toleration in Virginia* (1894), 37.

37 Charles F. James, *Documentary History of the Struggle for Religious Liberty in Virginia* (Lynchburg, 1900), 53.

Ages which separated faith and reason and put natural law on the side over against faith. The revival of this secularized version of the concept explains why the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries could use the law of nature as a ground for religious liberty, whereas the sixteenth century had employed what appeared to be the same language in favor of persecution. Melancthon could say that the execution of heretics is grounded in natural law and by that he meant the code of Deuteronomy, whereas Grotius and Pufendorf could declare, on the contrary, that variety in religion is the law of nature, by which they meant the visible order of society which in their day had come to exhibit religious diversity. The main point, however, is that an interest in a stable international order had taken precedence over the dominance of any religious group.<sup>33</sup>

We return now to the Protestant treatment of the premises for persecution. The third is the belief that persecution is of some good. Here the Protestant was compelled to inquire, "Good for what?" The Catholic would have had an immediate answer, for the obvious purpose of persecution for him would be to save souls. But the Protestant, if he were a Lutheran or more particularly a Calvinist, as we have noted, could never say this, because according to the doctrine of predestination the salvation of souls is predetermined by God. The purpose of persecution is not to alter His decrees but to vindicate His honor. To this the liberals replied that for this purpose also persecution is ineffective since God is quite able to look out for Himself. Neither can His honor be vindicated by burning men, for He takes no delight in holocausts. Here of course the attack is being leveled at the whole picture of God involved in the theory of predestination. Over against the Calvinist deity is set the Erasmian, who is "slow to anger and plenteous in mercy." Erasmus' tract on the "Immense Mercy of God" was very influential on this type of thought and inspired another treatise with a similar title by Curio on the "Amplitude

38 I have dealt briefly with this subject in "The Appeal to Reason and the Constitution" in *The Constitution Reconsidered*, ed. Conyers Read (New York, 1938). The basic discussions are those of Otto Gierke, *Johannes Althusius* (Breslau, 1880), and *Natural Law and the Theory of Society, 1500-1800*, tr. Ernest Barker (Cambridge, Eng., 1934). Cf. Hildegard Doer, *Thomasius Stellung zur landesherrlichen Kirchenregiment* (Bonn, 1917). The secularized natural law did not preclude the suppression of atheism as subversive of society. So Christoph. Matthaei Pfaffii . . . *commentationes . . . ad Verba Christi . . . Compelle ad intrandum . . . De Zizaniis . . .* (Frankfurt, 1753). Cf. Francesco Ruffini, *La Libertà Religiosa* (Torin, 1901), 233-257.



of God's Mercy." From these writers the line runs through Castellio to the Arminians, Remonstrants, and Universalists.<sup>39</sup>

The champions of liberty while hammering at the notion that persecution either should or can glorify God, at the same time drew from the Calvinist arsenal in order to batter the Catholic position that persecution can be of any avail in saving souls. The doctrine of predestination at this point became a weapon of liberty on the ground that if man's salvation depends wholly on God then constraint is futile. Here we see why the theory of predestination cuts both ways. On the Godward side it means indifference to the fate of the damned, but on the manward side it means impotence to alter matters by coercion. The particular determinist slogan on which the liberals fastened was a phrase from the Apostle Paul which in the Vulgate reads: *Gratia enim estis salvati per fidem, et hoc non ex vobis: Dei enim donum est.* (Eph. 2:8). Whence the formulation *fides donum Dei*, which naturally became a favorite text for all the predestinarians from Augustine to Calvin.<sup>40</sup> The first to use it in the interests of liberty, to my knowledge, was Luther in his tract "On Civil Government," where he asserted that "Faith is a free work to which no one can be forced. It is a divine work in the Spirit. Let alone then that outward force should compel or create it."<sup>41</sup> Long after Luther had recoiled from this position the Protestant liberals, even though themselves inclined to free-will and Universalism, captured the slogan for their cause. The Swiss used it.<sup>42</sup> The Bohemians used it;<sup>43</sup> the Dutch used it,<sup>44</sup> and

39 I have referred to the subject in my *Castellio's Concerning Heretics*. The thought of Curio is now well treated by Delio Cantimori, *Eretici Italiani del Cinquecento* (Florence, 1939).

The treatise of Erasmus has been translated by Charles O'Malley and published by the Sutor Branch of the Cal. State Library (May, 1940).

40 Augustine, *Enchiridion*, XXXI; Calvin, *Institutes*, III, ii, 33 = *Calvini Opera*, II, 426 and *Catechismus*, *Calvini Opera*, V, 334.

41 W. A. XI, 264, 1523.

42 Mandate of the Town Council of Basel, Feb. 29, 1528. "Diewil der gloub ein gab gottes . . . darumb es unbillich, das ein burger unnd nachpur vonn des glauben wegenn, der doch inn keins mennschen gwalt, den andern hassenn, sonnder vil mer ein annderenn duldenn . . ." Paul Roth, *Aktensammlung zur Geschichte der Basler Reformation* (Basel, 1937), III, 50.

43 Professor Odložilik calls my attention to a letter of Jan of Pernstein to Ferdinand, Dec. 2, 1539, in which protest is made against religious persecution. *Fides autem, rex elementissime, donum est Dei, et cui a Deo non datur, ab hominibus minime potest dari.* *Archiv český*, XX (1902), 86.

44 *Want het geloof is'n gave Gods.* A. A. Van Schelven, "De Opkomst van de Idee der Politieke Tolerantie in de 16e eeuwsehe Nederlanden." *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis*, XLVI (1931), 344.

the Hungarians in the first official edict of toleration promulgated in 1568 decreed that no one should be imprisoned or discharged because of his belief, *denn der Glaube ist Gottesgeschenk*.<sup>45</sup>

Because, however, the liberals in general were not themselves predestinarian in their thought, they preferred to give the determinist argument a different slant and shifted it from the soul to the mind. There is a determinism of the intellect. No more can the mind assent to that to which it does not assent than can the eye see as red that which it sees as blue. Constraint will not mend matters. In some cases this determinism is absolute. A moron never can grasp an argument; but in other cases the point is simply that apperception is slow and impeded by many obstacles. To effect conversion we must then master the art of persuasion. The greatest hindrances to clear sight are passion, pride, and prejudice, and these are only accentuated by vainglory and arrogance on the part of the one who is seeking to persuade. Humility and obvious devotion above everything else to the truth are the prime requisites for winning converts. No one better enunciated this point of view than Acontius. Beneath it all of course lies a confidence in the ability of truth to command assent in the long run. Lessing thus justified his publication of the Reimarus fragments on the ground that he had greater confidence in Christianity than his opponents because he was persuaded of its capacity to stand up under any attack.<sup>46</sup>

Thus far we have been considering the problem of liberty in religion from the point of view of ideas. We have observed that the Catholic and Protestant theories of persecution do not seriously differ but that the theory of liberty is capable of much greater flexibility in Protestantism. Now the problem must be considered from the institutional point of view both as to the theory of the church and as to the theory and administration of the state.

Christian history exhibits two main theories of the church. They are sometimes distinguished by calling the one the church type and the other the sect. In England the terminology has

45 Frederich Teutsch, *Geshichte der evangelischen Kirchen in Siebenbürgen* (2 vols., Hermannstadt, 1921-22), I, 284.

46 *Sämtliche Schriften*, XIII (Leipzig, 1897), 142.

been more frequent of the "parish" versus the "gathered" church. They differ markedly in their attitude to religious liberty. The church type is based on a sacramental theory of salvation in which force is more appropriate because the sacrament can be regarded as a "medicine of immortality" which will benefit the recipient whether he likes it or not. The sacrament of baptism is administered to babies. In a Christian land the church is then considered to include all those born and baptized into the community. Alliance with the state becomes more natural because both church and state comprise the same persons. Salvation outside the church is impossible because the church, even the visible church, is like the ark of Noah outside of which no souls were saved. To be in the ark one must receive the sacraments, subscribe to the doctrines, and obey the officers. Achievement of the moral demands is not so imperative because the unclean beasts were allowed in the ark. They are the tares to be left until the harvest. The heretics are not the tares. To them applies the text, *Compelle intrare*, for they are comparable to Noah's wife in the mystery plays, who, incredulous of the flood, refused to board the ship until picked up bodily and shoved up the gang-plank by her sturdy sons, whose place in the Christian commonwealth is taken by the secular arm. This theory of the church fits in with the ideal of comprehension and latitudinarianism. The way to heaven is not to be made narrower than necessary and as many as possible are to be induced to walk in it.

The sectarian theory of the church looks upon the institution less as an ark of salvation than as a city set upon a hill to save itself and the world by an example of righteousness. The emphasis is ethical rather than sacramental. The tares are the heretics who must be left outside and not compelled to come in lest they sully the purity of the community. The moral offenders are not the tares and they must be excluded by excommunication. Babies are not to be baptized and church membership depends on mature conversion. This the state cannot effect by the sword of the magistrate. All constraint in religion is renounced and commonly any alliance with the state is repudiated, since the state is instituted by God because of sinners and is to be administered only by sinners. This view of the church makes it exclusive. The ideal of compre-

hension is rejected and liberty is demanded to form small purist groups. The slogan of this party is:

We are the choice elected few:  
Let all the rest be damned:  
There's room enough in hell for you.  
We won't have heaven crammed.<sup>47</sup>

An attempt at the combination of these two types was made by Calvin, who tried to achieve a church coterminous with the community and at the same time comprising none but the saints. This could be done only by excluding the unworthy both from the church and from the community. Excommunication and banishment thus tended to coincide. In Geneva this was easy because it was a select community due both to expulsions and to a numerous increment of refugees. In England, Scotland, and New England, where the population was larger and less select, the problem was not so simple. In England a theocratic minority attempted to impose its will upon the land. In Scotland the inner cleavage manifested itself in the use of the token to distinguish those who were worthy to receive the sacrament from those who were broadly included in the national establishment. In New England the small frontier communities endeavored to recover the pattern of Geneva, in part by excommunication and banishment, but more largely by a restriction of the franchise. Only church members could vote. Church and state thus became one, but not the church and the community. In the New Haven Colony in 1649 the estimate is that out of 144 planters only 16 were free burgesses.<sup>48</sup> The Half Way Covenant was a move in the direction of the parish theory of the church, in that the children of non-church members of respectable conduct and opinions were received to baptism. Stoddardism made a further step in the same direction by extending the Lord's Supper to the less worthy in the hope of their conversion. The Great Awakening sought to redress the balance and to give reality to the theory of a comprehensive community of the saints by converting everybody. The result was rather to divide the churches into New Lights

<sup>47</sup> Michael Freund, *Die Idee der Toleranz*, 119. On the whole subject compare my article, "The Parable of the Tares as the Proof Text for Religious Liberty," *Church History*, I (1932), 67-89.

<sup>48</sup> Louise M. Greene, *The Development of Religious Liberty in Connecticut* (Boston, 1905), 62.

and Old. This situation, together with growing secularism, eventuated in the separation of church and state.<sup>49</sup>

With regard to the form of the state, whether one is more congenial to liberty than another, is difficult to say. Protestantism and Catholicism alike have made every manner of political alliance depending on which government at the moment would grant the maximum of recognition. Catholicism has been Carlist in Spain, legitimist in France, particularist in Italy, and democratic only in the United States.<sup>50</sup> Protestantism in the sixteenth century allied itself with the German princes and cities against the Empire, in France and Poland with the feudal nobles against the crown, in Switzerland with the popular fronts in the cantons, in England with the Tudor monarchy, in Hungary and Transylvania with the Turk rather than the Hapsburg. In the light of the outcome all one can say is that it does not pay to be on the losing side. The alliance with feudalism in Poland and France ended in disaster. The alignment with English monarchical nationalism proved successful.

As to the forms themselves, democracy is not, as we sometimes assume, of itself any guarantee of liberty. In Cromwell's days toleration could be achieved only by dictatorship. Cromwell could accord liberty to the Anglican Church, as he was disposed to do, only by flouting Parliament, which he was not disposed to do.<sup>51</sup> On the other hand, religious restrictions were progressively removed under enlightened despots like Frederick the Great. The democratic form of the state means most for religious liberty in those cases where the church seeks to influence political issues. Such activity will be tolerated only by a state which grants a similar liberty to various groups within its structure, like trade unions. The totalitarian state will concede freedom to those churches alone which confine themselves strictly to divine worship. Hence we may say that although the democratic state need not be tolerantly disposed, nevertheless in no other state is there so wide a scope for the activity and influence of the churches.

As an administrative problem, the policy to be adopted

49 I have discussed these theories of the church in "Congregationalism—the Middle Way," *Christendom* (Summer number, 1940).

50 Albert Houtin, *L'Americanisme* (Paris, 1904).

51 W. K. Jordan, *Religious Toleration*, III, 251.



by the state to dissident groups is conditioned only in part by its own constitution. Much more depends on the number and the temper of the groups themselves. Only if they are willing to live and to let live can the state drop the matter. If they are not so disposed, some measure of control becomes inevitable. Three solutions have been tried: territorialism, comprehension, and complete religious liberty. The formula of the first is *cuius regio eius religio*. The slogan of the second is *in necessariis unitas, in non necessariis libertas*, and the caption for the third is *pax dissidentium*. The first two methods were tried when the sects were intolerant of each other. The third became possible only as their temper changed.

Territorialism was rooted in the view which went back to antiquity that the state must be supported by a religion and that a single established religion is the best guarantee of the security and unity of the people. Such a motive led to the adoption of Christianity as the most favored religion of the Roman Empire. The division of Christendom occasioned by the Reformation was far from shattering the ideal. Since it could no longer be realized on a universal scale, the attempt was made to conserve it in many miniatures. The welfare of the state was still the determinative factor and the prince was permitted to decide which religion should prevail in his domains. No other religion should be tolerated. Dissenters could be banished. The system of the union of church and state, of the fusion of religion and the community, was thus conserved by an exchange of populations, and that was the point at which the system of *cuius regio* enshrined liberty of a sort. Extermination was displaced by emigration.

This solution was adopted in Europe at the Peace of Augsburg of 1555 which recognized, however, only the Catholic and Lutheran churches. The Peace of Westphalia of 1648 was conceived after the same pattern but added the Reformed. And the American Constitution of 1787 was still cast in the same mould. Though no religion was to be established by the federal government, the states were free to retain or introduce any or none. The colonies had naturally grown up on the principle of territorialism. The Congregationalists gravitated to Massachusetts and Connecticut, the Baptists to Rhode Island, the Presbyterians to New York and New Jersey. The Catholics went to Maryland, the Quakers and Pietist sects

colonized Pennsylvania, and the Anglicans predominated in the South. Established churches prevailed everywhere save in Rhode Island and Pennsylvania, which latter presented the anomaly of religious disabilities without an establishment. The federal Constitution interfered with none of this. Certain prerogatives of the Episcopalians in Virginia lasted until 1802.<sup>52</sup> The establishment of Congregationalism continued in Connecticut until 1818 and in Massachusetts until 1833. In New Hampshire civil disabilities against Jews and Catholics prevail to this day.<sup>53</sup>

As a matter of fact territorialism was nowhere so compatible with liberty as in the American colonies because the *ius emigrandi* was not too difficult of realization so long as the frontier remained open. When Hugh Peters, on his return to the old country, declared that the New England way of handling dissenters was to put them over the river,<sup>54</sup> he scarcely regarded such treatment as illiberal, for the land on the heterodox side of the stream was no worse than that on the orthodox bank. If Roger Williams was unacceptable in Massachusetts, after all, there was Rhode Island to which he could go.

Unhappily a practice once not incompatible with liberty has since passed into political theory and has become a pretext for stifling criticism of American institutions. The theorists of the social contract availed themselves of the *ius emigrandi* to bridge a serious gap in their scheme. For why should those merely born into a community be bound to a compact contracted by their remote ancestors? This is the political counterpart of the ecclesiastical problem of why those baptized as babies should be held accountable for the Apostles Creed. The answer was that non-removal from the community implies tacit consent. Those who do not subscribe may leave.<sup>55</sup> This theory has been carried over from the frontier churches and colonies and applied to the United States and now political criticism is silenced by the retort, "If you don't like it you may leave."

If today such advice is thoroughly unrealistic in a world

<sup>52</sup> James, *Documentary History*, 142.

<sup>53</sup> Joseph Francis Thorning, *Religious Liberty in Transition* (Diss., Washington D. C., 1931).

<sup>54</sup> William Haller, "The Puritan Background of the First Amendment," in *The Constitution Reconsidered*, ed. Conyers Read (New York, 1938), 134.

<sup>55</sup> For the employment of this expedient in political thought see J. W. Gough, *The Social Contract* (Oxford, 1936), 90 and 130.

without a frontier, at no time was the formula genuinely satisfactory. To pull up with goods and kin was never easy and for that reason governments had recourse to another expedient for solving the problem through a system of comprehension, which sought to satisfy as many as possible in the community by latitude as to their most cherished tenets. These being conceded, they were then asked to subscribe in other matters to a scheme of uniformity. The recusants on the fringes to the right and the left were subject to one penalty or another. The Augsburg Interim which Charles V endeavored to impose on Germany was cast in this mould and only after it failed did he have recourse to the territorialism of the Peace of Augsburg. The failure of this method in Germany is explicable in terms of the deep religious conviction of the Lutheran populace and the resentment aroused by the enforcement of the Interim at the hands of the Spanish troops.

The English settlement was built on the same theory and succeeded. The reasons for the failure of comprehension in Germany and the success in England are a matter of speculation, but some differences are obvious. Charles V tried to reconcile the Catholics and Protestants. Elizabeth attempted comprehension only within the Protestant frame. Charles was half Spanish. Elizabeth was English and Tudor. And the date was later. England was already wearied by change and persecution from Henry through Edward and Mary. The disastrous effects of the religious wars on the Continent had given dramatic reenforcement to the theories of the *Politiques*. Besides, Erastianism from the outset had been deeply rooted in England. This, by the way, was not the doctrine that the state might introduce any religion it chose, but that in a Christian community the king held the two keys rather than the pope. Here we have the culmination of medieval imperialistic thought transferred to the head of one of the new national states.<sup>56</sup> Perhaps deeper than any other reason is the closer continuity of the Reformation with the Renaissance in England than in other lands. The comprehensive philosophy of the Florentine Academy with its candles for Plato as well as for Christ suggested chapels for diverse cults beneath the one dome of the universal temple. The incursion of the Arminians further

<sup>56</sup> Edward Allen Whitney, "Erastianism and Divine Right," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, II, 4 (1939), 373-398.

reinforced universalist tendencies. The system of comprehension, however, succeeded only relatively in England, since the champions of the narrow way refused either to comprehend or to be comprehended and were able in time to win for themselves an unmolested place outside of the establishment.

The same thing happened in the American colonies, for if our federal Constitution is an instance of territorialism, the individual colonies, whatever the religion established, displayed the same basic pattern as that of England. The rigidity of the first settlements soon moved in the direction of comprehension. Witness the Half Way Covenant and Stoddardism, which we have already instanced as tending to the parish system. At the same time the dissenters on the fringe gained an increasing footing: Baptists, Quakers, and Presbyterians in Virginia; Episcopalians, Baptists, and Quakers in Connecticut; and these, plus Unitarians, in Massachusetts. The process was arrested at this stage in England, but in America passed on to the third solution of the problem, that of a complete religious liberty in which the dissidents agree to differ.

The *pax dissidentium* had its first exemplification, I believe, in Poland, where this very title was applied to the settlement of 1573, where those who frankly differed in religion covenanted to preserve the peace among themselves, to shed no blood, impose no penalties, and confiscate no goods because of diversity in faith and practice.<sup>57</sup> This peace, however, was made only between Protestant groups and was soon upset by the Counter Reformation.

The next great attempt at this type of settlement was made by Oliver Cromwell who abandoned the concept of the Christian commonwealth, with a single form of religion established by the state, in favor of a limited state exercising a benevolent patronage to a group of churches on equal footing.<sup>58</sup> The intolerance of the sects themselves wrecked his plan, and the establishment in England remains to this day, though combined with a system of complete toleration. The separation of church and state was a phenomenon in many

57 Ruffini, *La Libertà religiosa*, 461. Dr. Halecki informs me that an extensive discussion has taken place among Polish scholars in recent years as to whether the *Pax Dissidentium* completely excluded the territorial principle. The nobles were free, but was the same liberty extended to the peasants on their estates?

58 Ernest Barker, *Oliver Cromwell and the English People* (Cambridge, 1937).

lands of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries with varying degrees of friendliness or hostility in the process.<sup>59</sup>

The historical steps by which this culmination has been reached may now be briefly reviewed. Obviously the process has been slow. Very roughly I would say that the sixteenth century was characterized by the death penalty, the seventeenth by banishment, the eighteenth and early nineteenth by civil disabilities, and the last century by complete emancipation. There are, of course, exceptions and the pattern is truer for England than for other countries. Two developments in that country during the course of the seventeenth century are worthy of special note. The first in the field of law was the defeat of the death penalty even for blasphemy in the case of the Quaker, James Naylor. He had been guilty of messianic pretensions and was therefore not a heretic but by common consent a blasphemer. Luther's formula that not heresy but blasphemy should be punished would have sent him to the block. But he did not go. That point was settled.

The other notable change was in the area of church theory and is marked by the abandonment on the part of the sectaries of the ideal of a united Christendom. The Protestants of the sixteenth century had lamented the rending of the seamless robe of Christ and did their best to mend the rents among themselves.<sup>60</sup> But the sectaries of the seventeenth century definitely abandoned the ideal of unity and regarded diversity and competition as wholesome and stimulating,<sup>61</sup> after the analogy of *laissez faire* in trade. The Baptist, Samuel Richardson, in 1647 asked the rhetorical question

whether it be not better for us that a patent were granted to monopolize all the corn and cloth, and to have it measured out unto us at their price and pleasure, which yet were intolerable, as for some men to appoint and measure out unto us, what and how much we shall believe and practice in matters of religion?<sup>62</sup>

Similarly Henry Robinson argued:

In civil affairs we see by experience that every man most commonly understands best his own business, and such as do not, but rely upon

59 The documents on the separation of church and state are assembled and reprinted by Zaccaria Giacometti, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Trennung von Staat und Kirche* (Tübingen, 1926).

60 John T. McNeill, *Unitive Protestantism* (New York, 1930).

61 Jordan, *Religious Toleration*, III, 366 and 373.

62 *Tracts on Liberty of Conscience*, Hanserd Knollys Society (London, 1846), 258.



the managing and foresight of others . . . in a few years run out at heels, to the utter undoing of themselves and whole families; besides we think it a most gross solecism, and extravagant course in any State which did make Laws and Statutes, that the Subject might not go about and dispatch his wordly business, save in one general prescript form and manner, as a thing most irrational and inequitable . . . Besides, as our Saviour in the Parable . . . said, Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? So we know that every man is desirous to do with his own as he thinks good himself . . . but in spiritual matters it holdeth much stronger.<sup>63</sup>

Such passages ring the knell of *Corpus Christianum*. The analogy with trade, however, may explain why civil disabilities could survive even after liberty of worship had been achieved. For though competition of religions might be stimulating to religion, dissension might nevertheless be detrimental to trade. Therefore let all religions worship, but permit only one to govern.

This brief survey reminds us how slow has been the gain and how insecure, but definite gain at certain points and in certain lands is at any rate observable, enough at least to inspire valor.

Now we come to the residual and perennial problems. The whole question of tolerance is reopened with tragic insistence in our own day by the emergence of opinions which do damn souls and the more sincerely they are held the more dangerous do they become. They cannot be met by round-table discussions, since one side will not discuss. They cannot be overcome by any half-hearted and mildly sceptical attitude toward truth, nor will an appeal to ethics apart from theology offer stable ground. The ethics of love, mercy, and humanity are spurned and unless they can be shown to be grounded in the very structure of life, unless there be after all a natural law which is a divine law, then morality too goes by the board. Fanaticism can be overcome only through deep conviction. Whether there must also be a clash of body against body is a problem which must deeply agitate all those who have been nurtured in the liberal and pacifist tradition.

Again in relation to the state the problem of conscience has become acute. The rights of conscience have gained recognition on non-political questions, but can conscience claim

63 William Haller, *Tracts on Liberty*, III, 153-156.

immunity at the hands of the state if conscience imperils the security of the state? The problem was raised in the sixteenth century by Theodore Beza, who inquired whether the government could tolerate a conscientious objector to military service or a conscientious tyrannicide.<sup>64</sup> The view that even an erroneous conscience must be followed is double-edged, for it applies not only to the subject but also to the magistrate. If conscience must always be obeyed, the only possible outcome is a clash in which the magistrate suppresses and the objector suffers. Pierce Bayle, to my knowledge, was the first to formulate this political theory of inescapable conflict. The conscientious tyrannicide, he asserted, is bound to try to kill the ruler whom he esteems a tyrant and the conscientious magistrate is bound to do his best to stop him.<sup>65</sup>

The manner, however, in which such clashes are conducted must be influenced by the recognition that that which justifies each in his intransigence is a common loyalty to truth. Neither contestant can yield that which he now sees to be true until he is brought to see otherwise. Yet since truth is one, both sides in a controversy cannot be equally right and each should recognize that he may be mistaken and should concede to the other the duty of following his own lights. Conscience then has only a relative *ius divinum*. It is not an absolute guide to truth, but only an arbiter of action in that we can arrive at no ultimate truth save by loyalty to our present convictions. The recognition that each side in a controversy is equally bound by the claims of conscience will serve not to end conflict but to inspire respect. Let the objector, then, not rail against the magistrate, nor the magistrate revile the objector. Samuel Johnson remarked, "The only method by which religious truth can be established is by martyrdom. "The magistrate has a right to enforce what he thinks; and he who is conscious of the truth has a right to suffer. I am afraid there is no other way of ascertaining the truth but by persecution on the one hand and enduring it on the other."<sup>66</sup> This, however, is true only in a crisis and even in a crisis the asperity of the clash will be mitigated if the constringer and constrained are bound by the common constraint of the quest for truth.

64 See my *Castellio's Concerning Heretics*, 107.

65 *Oeuvres diverses de Mr. Pierre Bayle* (Hague, 1727), II, 432-433.

66 *Boswell's Life of Johnson* (Oxford ed., London, 1904), I, 511 under 1773.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## General

- Ruffini, Francesco, *La libertà religiosa* (Turin, 1901); English translation, *Religious Liberty* (London, 1912), is still the best survey on the factual side.
- Kühn, Johannes, *Toleranz und Offenbarung* (Leipzig, 1923), constitutes the most illuminating discussion of the ideas of Protestant groups.
- The following studies are less comprehensive.
- Bainton, Roland H., *Castellio's Concerning Heretics* (New York, 1935). The introduction deals briefly with the early Church and with a number of Reformation figures.
- "Academic Freedom in the light of the Struggle for Religious Liberty," *Proceedings of the Middle States Association of History Teachers*, XXXIII (1935), 37-44. A very brief sketch, largely incorporated in the present article.
- Burr, George Lincoln, *Persecution and Liberty, Essays in Honor of* (New York, 1931), contains essays by Ernest W. Nelson on "The Theory of Persecution," Austin P. Evans, "Some Aspects of Medieval Heresy," Wallace K. Ferguson, "The Attitude of Erasmus toward Toleration," and by myself on "Sebastian Castellio and the Toleration Controversy of the Sixteenth Century."
- "Anent the Middle Ages," *American Historical Review*, XVIII (1913), 710-726.
- "Liberals and Liberty Four Hundred Years Ago," *Proceedings of the Unitarian Historical Society*, II (1933), Part 2.
- Garrison, Winfred Ernest, *Intolerance* (New York, 1934).
- Hoffmann, Heinrich, article "Toleranz" in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*.
- Matagrín, Amédée, *Histoire de la Tolérance Religieuse* (Paris, 1905).
- Schaff, Philip, "Progress of Toleration as shown in the history of Toleration Acts," *Papers, Am. Soc. Church History*, I (1889).

## Germany and Switzerland in the Age of the Reformation

- Hermelink, Heinrich, "Der Toleranzgedanke im Reformationszeitalter," *Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte*, XCVIII (Leipzig, 1908).
- Koehler, Walther, *Reformation und Ketzerprozess* (Tübingen, 1901).
- Murray, Robert Henry, *Erasmus and Luther: Their Attitude to Toleration* (London and New York, 1920).
- Paulus, Nikolaus, *Protestantismus und Toleranz im 16. Jahrhundert*. (Freiburg i. Br., 1911). Catholic, very thorough as to facts.
- Völker, Karl, *Toleranz und Intoleranz im Zeitalter der Reformation* (Leipzig, 1912).
- More restricted aspects of the subject are handled by:
- Bainton, Roland H., "The Development and Consistency of Luther's Attitude to Religious Liberty," *Harvard Theological Review*, XXII (1929), 107-149.

Evans, Austin P., *An Episode in the Struggle for Religious Freedom* (New York, 1924).

Faulkner, J. A., "Luther and Toleration," *Papers of the Am. Soc. of Church History*, 2d ser. (1914), 131-153.

Wappler, Paul, *Inquisition und Ketzerprozesse in Zwickau zur Reformationszeit* (Leipzig, 1908).

—*Die Stellung Kursachsens und des Landgrafen Philipp von Hessen zur Täuferbewegung* (Münster i. W., 1910).

#### Spain and Portugal in the Sixteenth Century

Lea, Henry C., *History of the Inquisition in Spain* (New York, 1922), III, 411-479, gives a brief summary of the treatment of Protestantism in Spain. He drew heavily and avowedly on Menéndez y Pelayo, "Historia de los heterodoxos españoles," 2d ed. in the *Obras completas* (Madrid, 1911-33).

Bell, Aubrey, F. G. "Liberty in Sixteenth Century Spain," *Bulletin of Spanish Studies* X, 37 (1933), 164-79 gives a brief summary.

Bataillon, Marcel, *Erasmus et L'Espagne* (Paris, 1937), is splendid for the treatment of the Alumbrados and Erasmians.

Schaefer, Ernest, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des spanischen Protestantismus und der Inquisition im 16. Jahrhundert* (3 vols., Gütersloh, 1902), covers the trials of Protestants before the Inquisition.

Aitken, James M., *The Trial of George Buchanan before the Lisbon Inquisition* (Edinburgh, 1939), gives the documents and a good discussion.

#### Italy

Amabile, Luigi, *Il Santo Officio della Inquisizione in Napoli* (2 vols., Città di Castello, 1892).

Buschbell, Gottfried, "Reformation und Inquisition in Italien um die Mitte des XVI Jahrhunderts," *Quellen und Schriften . . . Görresgesellschaft*, XIII (1910).

#### France

##### Sixteenth Century:

Münzer, Georg Florian, *Franz I und die Anfänge der französischen Reformation* (Diss., Freiburg i. Br., 1935).

Weiss, Nathanaël, *La Chambre Ardente* (Paris, 1889).

##### Later periods:

Bonet-Maury, Gaston, *Die Gewissensfreiheit in Frankreich vom Edikt von Nantes bis zur Gegenwart* (Leipzig, 1912).

Puaux, Frank, *Les Précurseurs français de la Tolérance au XVIIe siècle* (Paris, 1881).

#### Holland

Van Schelven, A. A., "De Opkomst van de Idee der Politieke Tolerantie in de 16e eeuwse Nederlanden," *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis*, XLVI (1931), 235-47, 337-388.

#### England

Banner, Hypatia Bradlaugh, *Penalties upon Opinion* (London, 1934), deals with the quite recent period.

Freund, Michael, "Die Idee der Toleranz im England der Grossen

Revolution," in *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte*, XII (Halle, 1927), gives a very illuminating discussion of the religious ideas.

Jordan, Wilbur Kitchener, *The Development of Religious Toleration in England* (4 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1932-1940). Unsurpassed for a thorough survey of the literature, but better for the discussion of political than religious ideas.

Lyon, Thomas, *The Theory of Religious Liberty in England, 1603-39* (Cambridge, Eng., 1937); useful as revealing some pattern in the welter.

Meyer, Arnold Oskar, "Der Toleranzgedanke in England der Stuarts." *Historische Zeitschrift*, CVIII (1912), 255-94; protests against laying the stress on secular factors.

Mullet, Charles F., "Some Essays on Toleration in Late Eighteenth Century England," *Church History*, VII (1933), 24-44 reveals that when persecution had narrowed down to civil disabilities the arguments against it were no different from those of the sixteenth century.

St. John, Wallace, *The Contest for Liberty of Conscience in England* (Chicago, 1900).

Scott, Nancy Elnora, *The Limits of Toleration within the Church of England from 1632-1642* (Thesis, Univ. of Pa., 1912).

Seaton, A. A., "The Theory of Toleration under the Later Stuarts," in *Cambridge Historical Essays*, XIX (Cambridge, 1911).

#### The United States

Cobb, Sanford, H. *The Rise of Religious Liberty in America* (New York, 1902).

Thorning, Joseph Francis, *Religious Liberty in Transition* (Diss., Washington, D. C., 1931).

#### Connecticut

Coons, Paul Wakeman, *The Achievement of Religious Liberty in Connecticut*, (New Haven, 1936).

Greene, Louise M., *The Development of Religious Liberty in Connecticut* (Boston, 1905).

Purcell, Richard J., *Connecticut in Transition 1775-1818* (Washington, D. C., 1918).

#### Virginia

James, Charles F., *Documentary History of the Struggle for Religious Liberty in Virginia* (Lynchburg, 1900).

McIlwaine, Henry R., *The Struggle of Protestant Dissenters for Religious Toleration in Virginia*. Johns Hopkins Studies XII (1894).



## CLASSICAL AND BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP IN THE AGE OF THE RENAISSANCE AND REFORMATION

DEAN P. LOCKWOOD

*Haverford College*

and

ROLAND H. BAINTON

*Yale Divinity School*

Humanists and reformers in the age of the Renaissance and Reformation were concerned for the revival of antiquity both classical and Biblical. Some stressed one and some the other and some like Erasmus were interested in both. Because of the close relation of the two fields, we have brought together into one chapter two essays dealing first with the classical and then with the Biblical scholarship of our period.<sup>1</sup>

### I

#### WHAT IS CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP?

In simplest terms classical scholarship is first-hand knowledge of the languages and the culture of ancient Greece and Rome. And yet, definite as this sounds, it is far from being a uniform discipline. In various eras the knowledge of the classics—and the use to which it has been put—has differed greatly, just as it still differs greatly at the present day in different countries. What, for instance, could be more unlike than the classical traditions of modern England and modern Germany? We must beware, therefore, of projecting back into the Renaissance any contemporary attitude toward the classics. In fact the sort of critical knowledge of antiquity that now rates as true scholarship was hardly known until the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. During the Renais-

<sup>1</sup> The Committee on Renaissance Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies is sponsoring the publication of a work surveying and evaluating the recent scholarship in the field broadly designated as the Renaissance and ranging roughly from 1450 to 1650. The chapters will first appear in the journals and will subsequently be gathered together in one or more volumes.

sance it was still in process of formation! But let us not despise the efforts of the "classical scholars," i. e. the so-called "humanists," of the Renaissance, even though most of them were those humbler brethren whom Douglas Bush dismisses with a few kind words.<sup>2</sup> What they lacked in pure scholarship, they made up in enthusiasm, breadth of influence, and creative urge. And to mention some of the greater "philosophic humanists," the *effective* scholarship of a Petrarch, a Francesco Barbaro, a Pontano, a Thomas More, an Erasmus, a Rabelais—each in his own way and in his own sphere—has no equal today.

What is the use nowadays of a classical scholarship that embodies the supreme heritage of the ages, if the world turns a deaf ear to it? During the Renaissance, on the other hand, more than at any other time, the western world was attentive to those who purported to be apostles of classical antiquity. For better or for worse, classical scholarship became the fashion, first in Italy in the fourteenth century, and later in other lands—popularized to a degree that it had never been in the Middle Ages, and influencing politics, religion, literature, education, science, philosophy, and fine arts to an extent that would amaze us today. Though sceptics were not unknown, the fundamental tenet of belief, more wide-spread during the Renaissance than at any other time, was that the Greeks and Romans were our superiors, and that from them modern man had everything to learn! By and large, of course, both in the Middle Ages and in the Renaissance, this belief was justified; and only later did it begin gradually to be outmoded. Call it what you will—the classical ideal or the classical illusion—during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries it dominated most of the intellectual life of the western world.

What were the activities of classical scholars during the Renaissance? (We might almost ask: what were the scholarly activities of educated persons, for almost everyone was at least a dabbler in antiquity?) In the earlier period of classical humanism, i. e. during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, all classical scholarship was a process of exploration and discovery—in other words, of rapid expansion of the bounds

<sup>2</sup> *The Renaissance and English Humanism* (Toronto, 1939), 40-41.

of knowledge. Starting from the popular or average classical heritage of the Middle Ages (not that of a Hildebert of Lavardin or a John of Salisbury)—consisting of some twenty-odd major Roman authors, accompanied by a traditional and rather distorted picture of the larger Greco-Roman background—the humanists set out, as only scientists can set out today, to explore the known world for new materials and data, to focus the microscope of criticism on what was already known, and to formulate new general hypotheses. What they found and what they accomplished was of course only relatively “new”: it was conceived, however, in a new spirit. But regarding only the more tangible portion of their labors, we may say that in the field of classical Roman literature they approximately doubled the available material; and in the field of classical Greek literature—the real touchstone of the Renaissance—they recaptured the whole! (By classical Greek literature I mean, of course, *belles lettres* and all that antedates and all that counterbalances Aristotle!) At the same time the humanistic conception of Greco-Roman civilization grew clearer and more potent.

In the second period of classical humanism, i. e. the sixteenth century, the universal adoption and popularization of the art of printing supplied a new field of activity and had far-reaching results. Classical scholarship, though continuing to grow and expand, was now busy with the printing and editing of the whole of classical Greek and Latin literature, general and technical, pagan and Christian, and with the assimilation of this vast body of knowledge, which was now made available to everyone everywhere. Although the old enthusiasm persisted, it was losing its general appeal. Classical scholarship was becoming too technical and its range too vast for popular consumption. The philosophical enthusiasts of the earlier period, preaching a vague Utopian gospel of new horizons “widening toward the past,” had given place largely to plodding editors of dry and monumental classical texts. The function of the “humanist” had become ever narrower and more precise; from a scholarly man-of-letters he had developed into an erudite classicist; the process of evolution which had begun with a Petrarch ended in the eighteenth century with a Bentley.

## II

THE MODERN APPROACH TO THE CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP  
OF THE RENAISSANCE

In the nineteenth century the history of classical scholarship as a whole, from the earliest times to now, was officially recognized as a subdivision of classical *Altertumswissenschaft*, though the validity of this classification may well be questioned, for surely (to take an analogous case) the "history of history" is a very different matter from history itself. If the history of scholarship is to have any value, either its contribution to the "history of thought" (a new member of the academic circle), or its relation to *belles lettres*, must be stressed. In both respects the history of classical scholarship as a whole has been merely sketched by most modern scholars. There are a number of "Outlines," of which W. Kroll, *Geschichte der klassischen Philologie* (2nd ed., Berlin, 1919), is the best example. The only treatment of the subject on a more extensive scale is J. E. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship* (Cambridge, vol. I, 3rd ed., 1921; vols. II-III, still in their 1st ed., 1908). In this encyclopedic but very uneven work the period of the Renaissance occupies the first 276 pages of the second volume; it is hardly more, however, than a compilation of biographical and bibliographical data concerning individual scholars.

There is no lack of opportunity for further work along these lines. More and better "Outlines" may be compiled, both local and universal. To all further outlines, however, we may raise the question: *cui bono*? What is needed is a magnificent synthesis, a complete history of the evolution of classical scholarship. But whether so vast and difficult a work will ever be written is hard to say.

Not only in the whole field of classical scholarship, but also in the limited period of the Renaissance, the problem is to isolate scholarship *per se* from other human activities. Can it be done; and if it can, is it worth doing? If successfully done, will it be arid and pedantic? I am speaking, of course, only of ambitious attempts to cover large areas. The still unpublished sources, moreover, of the factual history of Renaissance classical scholarship are enormous; they lie in the archives and libraries of Europe in such quantity that it will be long

before they are finally sorted and sifted. Scholars have succeeded better than any other class of men in preserving their own minutiae!

The more one subdivides the field into topics, however, the easier the work becomes—until finally we come down to the biographical unit, the individual. There we are on familiar ground, for classical scholarship, of one sort or another, was one of the activities of every humanist. Hence, every adequate biography of a humanist contributes to our knowledge of classical scholarship in the Renaissance. To attempt in this chapter, however, to list all such biographies would be tantamount to compiling a bibliography, not of classical scholarship, but of humanism! It will be appropriate, therefore, to indicate only a few outstanding studies of important humanists—studies which emphasize scholarly activities and attainments. Fundamental, both chronologically and for its intrinsic worth, is P. de Nolhac, *Pétrarque et l'humanisme* (2nd ed., 2 vols., Paris 1907). On Boccaccio there are several studies by Attilio Hortis, notably his *Studj sulle opere latine del Boccaccio* (Trieste, 1879). But why confine ourselves to modern biographies and studies? The works themselves of the earlier humanists are mines of information on the classical scholarship of the time, e. g. Novati's edition of the *Epistolario* of *Salutati* (4 vols., Rome 1891-1911). Next in order comes E. Walser, *Poggius* (Leipzig, 1914). And so on. But I am in danger, as I said before, of launching into a bibliography of humanism and the humanists, for classical scholarship is omnipresent! In short, one has but to ascertain whether a sound and critical treatise has been written on the life and works of any major humanist to know whether our knowledge of classical scholarship, as exemplified in his career, has been correspondingly advanced. By the same process one will discover what remains to be done. It is hardly necessary to specify; for a full biography is a *magnum opus*, and of such the supply never equals the demand. It is only neat little dissertation subjects that are hard to find! Plenty of humanists—whether their lives have already been written or not—are awaiting a competent modern biographer. I mention at random: Argyropulos, Phil. Beroaldus, Aug. Datus, Sig. Gelenius, Lil. Greg. Gyraldus, Dionys. Lambinus, M. A.



Majoragius, Hier. Mercurialis, M. A. Natta, Vinc. Obsopaeus, Janus Pannonius, Joh. Bapt. Pius, Priscianensis, Raphael Regius, M. A. Sabellicus, Horatius Toscanella, Georgius Trapezuntios, Pierius Valerianus, Polydore Vergil, Hier. Wolfius.

Furthermore, the classical scholarship of the Renaissance in general has been more fully discussed in the major treatises on classical humanism than in any separate study. First and foremost, there is the unique and fundamental work of Georg Voigt, *Die Wiederbelebung des klassisschen Altertums* (3rd ed. by M. Lehnerdt, 2 vols., Berlin, 1893; cf. the Italian translation from the *second* ed. by Valbusa, Firenze, 1888-90; and later than the third edition are the *Giunte e correzioni* by G. Zippel (Firenze, 1897). In fact, we can almost regard this work as a specific treatise on classical scholarship in the Renaissance, interpreted in the broadest sense. But the work is perhaps too broad in its scope to be so classified; and for our purposes it is too limited in its range; for it portrays, on the whole, only Italian humanism of the fifteenth century. At any rate, it is now out of date—in quantity, that is, rather than in quality. A great desideratum—perhaps the greatest in the field of the history of classical scholarship in the Renaissance (at least, for English readers)—would be a translation, revision, and expansion of Voigt's masterly work, thus making a sort of *Handbuch* of classical humanism and its sources. But that would be a *magnum opus* indeed, and could perhaps only be carried out as a co-operative project. (An even more pressing need for bare translation is a version into English, or any other western tongue, of Michael Korelin, *The Older Italian Humanism* (Moscow, 1892; vols. 14-15 of the *Memoirs of the University of Moscow*).

To conclude my rambling remarks on extensive works in which the classical scholarship of the Renaissance has a definite and important place, I must mention one or two of the major histories of national literatures: for France, the encyclopedic *Histoire littéraire de la France* (begun in 1733), of which vols. 24-36 sqq. (still being published) are on the fourteenth century; and for Italy the *Storia letteraria d'Italia* (3rd. ed., Milano, 1929-34), in which Vittorio Rossi's *Quattrocento* is a shining exemplar. There has never been a history of any of

the national literatures of the Renaissance that could equal Rossi's work in its command of both the vernacular and the Latin, its convincing picture of the interrelations of "literature" and "scholarship."

Since, therefore, there has been no complete synthesis of our knowledge of the classical scholarship of the Renaissance (and since there is not likely to be any for a long time to come), I turn to various specific topics and subdivisions of the field. Remigio Sabbadini (1850-1934), whose knowledge of the Italian humanists was supreme, showed good judgment in devoting a series of separate studies to important phases of the subject, rather than trying to compass the whole in one comprehensive, and unwieldy, treatise. I cannot do better than to take certain of the works of Sabbadini as starting-points for the discussion of subsequent scholarly work along the same or similar lines.

(1) Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici* (2 vols., 1905-14); the definitive treatment of the discovery of classical manuscripts by the humanists. Only slight additions have been made, and will continue to be made, to this monumental and intricate assemblage of facts. Students who make minor "discoveries" along this line may "publish" them in learned periodicals. It will be long before the whole work needs to be redone. The emphasis here is on ancient manuscripts of classical authors, written long before the Renaissance and brought to light by the scholars of the Renaissance. But the finding of an old manuscript had not the immediate usefulness for critics and historians in the fifteenth century that it has now; for books were still copied by hand, as they had always been since time immemorial; and the humanists could only carry on the slow process of copying and disseminating newly-discovered authors and works with whatever degree of scholarly accuracy and insight they could command. This brings us to the second topic:

(2) Sabbadini, *Storia e critica di testi latini* (1914). This work cannot be called definitive nor even comprehensive; Sabbadini himself published other miscellanies along the same line. In this field the details are practically endless, and will continue to be inexhaustible. Text criticism is not an exact science; the contributions of the scholars of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries to the establishment of our classical texts

will continue to be debated and evaluated and re-evaluated. Special studies of the text-tradition of individual Greek and Latin authors in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, and on the critical methods of individual humanists, are legion. A recent general treatise of significance is that of G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* (1934). In an important chapter Pasquali maintains that late manuscripts (i. e. humanistic copies) may often be as valuable as early ones (in many fields of scholarship the word "late" has a curiously sinister connotation).

The topics discussed in the two preceding paragraphs deal with manuscripts. This leads me to digress for a moment to the consideration of certain allied topics. In regard to the manuscript books of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries in general and the scholarly background of their production, much is to be gleaned from the great printed catalogs of the manuscript collections of present-day libraries. Into this vast field I cannot go in detail. (Cf. W. Weinberger, *Wegweiser durch die Sammlungen altphilologischer Handschriften* [Wien, 1930], from *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie*.) The most notable series of catalogs now being published is that of the Vatican Library. Of special interest to Americans, as opening up the field for study in this country (now that Europe is unsafe) is S. de Rici's *Census* (1935, sqq.).

Then there are the histories of the great modern libraries: the Bibliothèque Nationale, the Vatican, San Marco, the Laurentian-Medicean, and many others—and even some of the forgotten libraries, like that of the Seraglio in Istanbul—whose formation or re-formation goes back to the time of the Renaissance. In this field detailed contributions are constantly being made. The field is almost endless. For the accumulation of data on the history of any library, however, one must perforce spend many years on the spot, preferably as librarian!

But most significant for our general subject—or most spectacular, at least—are the studies and reconstructions of libraries that are no longer in existence. This has been a favorite field of study and will continue to be. In addition to a few general works (e. g. G. Mercati, *Per la storia dei manoscritti greci di Genova . . .* [1935]) and the great collections of the ancient catalogs of libraries (e. g. those now being edited

by P. Lehmann, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz* [1918 sqq.]), there have been important monographs on the libraries of individual princes and patrons (e. g. A. de Havesy, *La bibliothèque de Matthias Corvin* [Paris, 1923]) and of humanists (e. g. O. Hecker, *Boccaccio-Funde* [Braunschweig, 1902]; P. Kibre, *The Library of Pico della Mirandola* [New York, 1936]). Of course, the reconstruction of a lost library is a rather unpredictable matter. One cannot choose whose library one will find—or search in vain for! One is dependent on the happy discovery of reliable clues—signatures, monograms, shelfmarks, etc. Most libraries of other days have been dispersed (or destroyed) without a trace. As is the case with so many other scholarly projects, the student (if he is a sharp-eyed browser in libraries and archives) finds his own topics or creates his own field.

Turning now from the topic of manuscripts and authors in manuscripts to the more cloistered activities of the humanists at home and in the classroom, we come—in the footsteps of our pathfinder, Sabbadini—to

(3) *Il metodo degli umanisti* (ca. 1922). This is Sabbadini's most original work—brief, but meaty! It deals in part with pedagogical methods and routine (which are to be discussed in another survey): I can only mention, *en passant*, that there are certain pedagogical problems which are very closely allied to the history of classical scholarship (cf. A. Burk, *Die Pädagogik des Isokrates als Grundlegung des humanistischen Bildungsideals* [Würzburg, 1925]; and, of course, many studies of Quintilian). Various topics which form part of Sabbadini's discussion in *Il metodo* reappear in subsequent publications by other scholars, e. g. the humanistic conception of the history of Latin literature is exemplified in B. L. Ullman's edition of Sicco Polenton, *Scriptorum illustrium latinae linguae libri* [1928]. Who will edit Giovanni Tortelli's *De Orthographia*?) Another important topic is the dissemination of Greek literature through translation and the spread of the Hellenic ideal in general: from the great movement, fostered by Pope Nicholas V, for the translation of all Greek literature into Latin, we pass to the vast field of the translation from Greek and Latin into the various modern languages and the general influence of the classics on modern literatures—which I shall discuss later. And

this brings us to the subject of literary style and literary criticism, which, if not a branch of classical scholarship, is (in the Renaissance particularly) an off-shoot, at least.

(4) Sabbadini, *Storia del Ciceronianismo* (1886); supplemented by *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino* (1896), and by more recent works by other scholars: cf. E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa* (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1923, end of vol. II). The problem of ciceronianism in the Latin works of the humanists (cf. Bembo, Erasmus, *et al.*) developed in the sixteenth century into the related problem of the choice of language, "*la querelle des anciens et des modernes*," not, of course, in France only, but in Italy (C. Trabalza, *Storia della grammatica italiana* [Milano, 1908]; V. Vivaldi, *Storia delle controversie linguistiche* [1925]), and in other countries. Finally, all is summed up in the more comprehensive works on the history of literary criticism (e. g. G. Saintsbury, *History of Criticism* . . . [vol. I, 1900]; J. E. Spingarn, *History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance* [revised ed., New York, 1908]; I. G. Isola, *La critica del Rinascimento* [2 vols., Livorno, 1907]; Borinski, *Die Antike in Poetik und Kunsttheorie*, [vol. I, Leipzig, 1914]; and others)—a large subject which does not lend itself to factual treatment, but must constantly be reconsidered in the light of the changing tastes of successive generations. To specify what there is to be done in this field would be futile: if anyone has a new and better theory of literary criticism, in whole or in part, let him expound it! In the later Renaissance, of course, the field of literary criticism develops in even greater detail in the national literatures; just where the dividing line lies between general principles, which may be allied to classical scholarship, and specific problems which are wholly in the field of the modern languages and literatures, it is often hard to say.

So much for the main trails blazed by Sabbadini. Whether to go further afield along other paths, is a dubious question. Is not the influence of the classics on posterity too large a subject to be considered under classical scholarship? So far, in this chapter, we have taken "classical scholarship" in the technical or professional sense; not as synonymous with polite learning. It is true, one can not always draw a sharp line of demarcation; the greatest personalities, the "philosophical humanists"



(such as Petrarch or Erasmus), were scholars in both senses of the term. But our chief interest is perforce in the mere disseminators of Latin and Greek and their routine work of discovery, exposition, and interpretation.

Surely the influence of a given classical author (Vergil, for instance, or Terence) or of a literary type (such as the pastoral) or of a classical tradition (such as Greek mythology) on any one of the modern literatures is primarily the concern of the students of that literature. The great difficulty in attempting to approach these problems from the classical end is that there are too many modern literatures! Even within the five chief areas (English, French, German, Italian, Spanish) it would be an extraordinary feat for one person to keep up with the study of the influence of the classics (and the deeper influences, rather than the superficial imitations and plagiarisms, are largely unplumbed). But what right have we to neglect the lesser literatures ("lesser" only to us): Russian, Czech, Polish, Hungarian, Rumanian, Dutch, Portuguese—not to mention important dialects and many minor tongues? In all these literatures, large and small, classical influences have been the object of constant and intensive study, but to list the unintelligible titles of typical books and articles would be futile.

If the modern classicist is to assume any responsibility, it can only be (*cheu!*) for the more ambitious works that transcend national lines; such works, being universal or quasi-universal in their scope, cannot claim asylum within the precinct of any one modern literature. The best example of such a universal treatise is, fittingly, by a Polish scholar (the work itself, fortunately, not in Polish): Th. Zielinski, *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte* (4th ed., 1929). There have been a few others (mostly sketchy and incomplete): e. g. K. von Reinhardstoettner, *Plautus . . .* (Leipzig, 1886); W. Süss, *Aristophanes und die Nachwelt* (Leipzig, 1911); G. Finsler, *Homer in der Neuzeit* (Leipzig, 1912); and E. Stemplinger, *Horaz im Urteil der Jahrhunderte* (Leipzig, 1921). The period of the Renaissance is briefly surveyed in many volumes of that useful popular series, *Our Debt to Greece and Rome*, edited by G. D. Hadzsits. For those who would conduct researches in this field, almost any classical author may be chosen, and more limited topics are available in profusion.

Not all studies in this field, however, have been concerned solely with the classical influences on vernacular literature. A few have dealt with the classical sources of neo-Latin literature and may be regarded as lying wholly within the province of classical scholarship in the Renaissance. The best example is V. Zabughin, *Vergilio nel Rinascimento* (2 vols., Bologna, 1921-23). A good illustration of the value of a special study is A. C. Brinton, *Maphaeus Vegius and his thirteenth book of the Aeneid* (1930): here we see the living Vergil as the fifteenth century saw him.

Not only has very little been done in the field just mentioned, but no one has even begun to exploit the possibilities of anthologies (either for the undergraduate or for that mythological figure, the general reader), combining the classical authors and their humanistic imitators, who, by the way, are often less slavish than they are reputed to be, e. g. (1) selections from Lucretius, combined with passages from Capece, Paleario, Giordano Bruno, and Polignac; (2) hendecasyllabics from Catullus, *et al.*; (3) typical satires of Horace, Persius, and Juvenal with those of Filelfo and others. And so on. I am only advocating a revival of what was popular in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, when gentlemen preferred Latin. I am reminded of the Roman lawyer who told me a few years ago that he much preferred Fracastoro's *Gallicus Morbus* to *Vergil*.

Finally, there are "departments" of classical philology which have led more or less of an independent existence. It is hardly necessary to mention them all. Both grammar and rhetoric might find a place here, but I have associated them with literary style (see above, under the fourth and last of Sabbadini's works). One department of rhetoric, however, in the more technical sense, which deserves mention here, is mnemonics: see H. Hajdu, *Das mnemotechnische Schrifttum des Mittelalters* (Wien, 1936). The history of Greek studies in the West has often received distinct treatment, e. g. D. Pezzi, *La lingua greca antica* (introductory chapter, Torino, 1888). A practical problem (which verges on the pedagogical) is the pronunciation of Greek: see E. Drerup, *Die Schulaussprache des Griechischen . . .* (vol. I [xv-xvii centuries], 1930). The most obvious of all the semi-independent subjects, however, is archaeology, whose unscientific beginnings in the period of

the Renaissance have a romantic charm denied to more cloistered lucubrations: the excursions and explorations of Fra Giocondo, Andrea Mantegna, Cyriac of Ancona—who went “to awake the dead”—are among the most vivid tableaux of the Renaissance. Materials for the history of archaeology have been published in introductory chapters to some of the volumes of the *Corpus Inscriptionum latinarum*. The predominance of the epigraphical side of archaeology is natural. See R. de la Blanchère, *Histoire de l'épigraphie romaine* (Paris, 1887), and S. Chabert, *Histoire sommaire des études d'épigraphie grecque* (Paris, 1906).

So far, when not considering the Renaissance as a whole, I have spoken chiefly of the fifteenth century. Peculiar to the sixteenth century are the studies of the scholarly activities of the great editors and publishers—the three Manutii, the Stephani, Turnebus, Lambinus, and many others. Here our path crosses that of the history of printing. Fundamental works in this field are: A. A. Renouard's various *Annales* (e. g. “des Aldes,” “des Estiennes,” etc.), published a hundred years ago, and A. Firmin-Didot, *Alde Manuce et l'hellénisme à Venise* (Paris, 1875). Many monographs have appeared since, and there are opportunities for many more. Then there are the investigations, which have been popular of late, of the manuscripts used by particular humanists in particular editions—not to mention the more difficult puzzle of identifying and evaluating collations of manuscripts found in the printed editions which belonged to and were used by famous scholars of the sixteenth century, such as Pithou, Casaubon, Cruquius, and others. A good example of this sort of study is W. M. Lindsay, *The Codex Turnebi of Plautus* (Oxford, 1898); and there are the many studies of the early editions of Petronius by the late E. T. Sage and his pupils.

Classical scholarship in the Renaissance was universal. There had hardly arisen that distinction (so dear to the modern “classicist”) between “classical” and “post-classical” (or “late”). To Erasmus, as to Petrarch, (to take shining examples) the Fathers of the Church were on a par with the pagans; St. Augustine and Cicero, Seneca and Lactantius, were the guides of life; Plato and St. Basil, Plutarch and St. Chrysostom, were popular in translation. Patristic studies

were not differentiated from classical. Sometimes hallowed monuments of Christian Latin suffered from excess of humanistic zeal. The fine old hymns of the Breviary, for instance, were rewritten in more elegant styles. See A. Viscardi, *L'Innario . . . e il Rinascimento*, in *La Cultura* (VII, 3). We may go even further and note that north of the Alps the German humanists began the scholarly interest in medieval Latin. See J. Aschbach, *Roswitha und Conrad Celtes* (2nd ed., Wien, 1868), and H. Tiedemann, *Tacitus und das Nationalbewusstsein der deutschen Humanisten* (Berlin, 1913). In the history of patristic and medieval studies, undifferentiated from purely classical scholarship in the modern sense, there is still pioneer work to be done.

In conclusion, let me call attention to a type of publication, peculiar, so far as I know, to modern Italy, and quite unthinkable in the United States of America, namely, anthologies of articles and essays in *litterae humaniores*. The best and most recent example is Francesco Flamini, *Antologia della critica e dell'erudizione* (latest edition). To this work we may turn, therefore, for a bird's-eye-view of modern contributions to the understanding of Renaissance scholarship and literary history, comprising extracts from the works of such men as Carducci, Sabbadini, Novati, Villari, Del Lungo, and Croce—of whom Italy is proud.

### III

#### BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP

The age of the Renaissance and Reformation gave, if possible, an even greater stimulus to Biblical than to classical studies, because the Bible as a document of antiquity and a textbook of religion enlisted the interest alike of the humanist and of the reformer. Commentaries on the Sentences gave way to commentaries on the Bible to which one must still turn for much of the political and social as well as for the religious thinking of the day. Yet despite the importance of the subject no adequate work on the field of Biblical scholarship and influence in our period has ever appeared, nothing comparable, for example, to the work of Hans Rost for the Middle Ages.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Hans Rost, *Die Bibel im Mittelalter* (Augsburg, 1939). The bibliography of printed Bibles in many European tongues runs well into the sixteenth century.

A partial attempt was indeed once made by Berger, and his work is still useful especially for the account of the editions of Ximenes and Erasmus.<sup>4</sup> Farrar's work is likewise useful, but scarcely goes beyond summary sketches of the work of Valla, Erasmus, Luther, and Calvin.<sup>5</sup>

An adequate treatment should begin with the text and even prior to the text with the philological tools available for its study. Greek, of course, can be taken for granted, but Semitic scholarship outside of Jewish circles was largely inspired by Biblical interests. The Cabbala did indeed intrigue Pico and Reuchlin, but the Bible even more, and the only serious clash between humanism and the church was over freedom to prosecute Semitic studies. The *viri obscuri* lost the battle and Hebrew continued to be cultivated as an integral part of a theological education.<sup>6</sup>

The printing of the Bible in the original tongues is covered by Copinger.<sup>7</sup> The translations into Latin and the vernaculars have attracted a great deal of attention. Brief introductions to the subject are to be found in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart (I Bibelübersetzungen)* and in the useful little handbook of Guppy.<sup>8</sup> The Latin Bibles are described by Copinger,<sup>9</sup> whose collection is now housed in the library of the General Theological Seminary (Chelsea Square, New York). The German translation of Luther has given rise to an extensive literature which is covered in Taylor's admirable manual of problems.<sup>10</sup> The English Bible likewise has received considerable attention. An excellent account of how divergent estimates of the Reformation in general have affected

4 Samuel Berger, *La Bible au seizième siècle* (Paris, 1879).

5 Frederick W. Farrar, *History of Interpretation* (New York, 1886).

6 On the Biblical interests of the humanists we have: J. Lindeboom, *Het Bijbelsch Humanisme in Nederland* (Leiden, 1913), and H. J. Hak, "De Humanistische Waardeering van de H. Schrift in het bijzonder bij Marsilio Ficino en Faber Stapulensis," *Archief voor Nederlandsche Kerkgeschiedenis*, N. S. XXIX (1937), 77-90. Semitic studies, in general, are admirably covered in the bibliography of Karl Schottenloher, *Bibliographie zur deutschen Geschichte* (Leipzig, 1933-39), under the rubric *Hebräisches Sprachstudium*.

7 Walter Arthur Copinger, *The Bible and its Transmission*, (London, 1897).

8 Henry Guppy, *A brief sketch of the history of the transmission of the Bible* (Manchester, 1936).

9 Walter Arthur Copinger, *Catalogue of the Copinger Collection* (Manchester, 1893, with many facsimiles). Descriptions are given in the work by him listed above.

10 Archer Taylor, *Problems in German Literary History* (New York, 1939), 35-36. See also Schottenloher's *Bibliographie* under Luther and for the whole subject under "Bibel-Ausgaben," "Bibelglossar," "Bibelillustrationen."



appraisals of Tindale as a translator is given by Knappen in an article on Tindale.<sup>11</sup> The Tudor translations as a whole and one by one have been the subject of numerous monographs.<sup>12</sup> So too have the versions into various European tongues.<sup>13</sup>

The theory of translation occasioned controversies in the sixteenth century. Tindale was accused by More of a Protestant bias when *priest* became *presbyter* and *church* became *congregation*.<sup>14</sup> Castellio was reproached for a humanist bias when for the sake of linguistic purity he substituted *lavare* for *baptizare* and *respublica* for *ecclesia*. His classical periodic sentences ruined the parallelism of the Hebrew. In his French version, to avoid Greek roots like *holocauste*, he invented *brulage*. Yet his work was not without merit.<sup>15</sup>

The concept of Biblical inspiration has not been pursued to my knowledge systematically through the reformers as

11 M. M. Knappen, "William Tindale—First English Puritan," *Church History*, V (1936), 201-205.

12 Francis Fry, *A bibliographical Description of The New Testament* (London, 1878), covers forty editions of Tindale with 73 plates. Francis Fry, *A Description of the Great Bible* (and of other editions down to 1640. Half the volume consists of facsimilies. London, 1865). Alfred William Pollard, *Records of the English Bible: The documents relating to the translation and publication of the Bible in English, 1525-1611* (London, 1911). John Rothwell Slater, "The sources of Tyndale's Version of the Pentateuch." (Diss., Chicago, 1906). Albert H. Gerberich, "Luther and the English Bible." (Diss., Johns Hopkins, Lancaster, Pa., 1933). Henry Guppy, *William Tindale*, (Bull. John Rylands Lib., IX 2 [1925]). Henry Guppy, *Miles Coverdale*, (Bull. John Rylands Lib., XIX, 2 [1935]). Elizabeth Whittlesey Cleaveland, "A study of Tindale's Genesis compared with the Genesis of Coverdale and of the Authorized Version." *Yale Studies in English*, XLIII, (New York, 1911). Grace F. Swearingen, "Die englische Schriftsprache bei Coverdale," (Diss., Berlin, 1904). Harold Rideout Willoughby, "A Census of the Extant Coverdale Bibles," (n. d. n. p. mimeographed).

13 French translations are covered by Willem J. Van Eys, *Bibliographie des Bibles et des nouveaux Testaments en langue française des XV. et XVI siècles* (2 vols., Geneva, 1900 and 1901). Consult also Horst Kunze, "Die Bibelübersetzungen von Lefèvre d'Étaples und von P. R. Olivetan," *Leipziger Romanistische Studien* (Leipzig, 1935). Dutch translations are treated by H. van Druten, *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Bijbelvertaling* (2 vols., Leiden, 1895-98), a work which I have not been able to consult. For the Spanish translator, Cassiodore de Reina, there is still no better study than the old one by Edward Boehmer in *Bibliotheca Wiffeniana*, II, (Strassburg, 1883). Samuel Berger deals chiefly with the manuscript versions, but also with the printed translations of the sixteenth century into Spanish and Portuguese in his "Les Bibles Castellanes," *Romania*, XXVIII (1899). For bibliography of works dealing with translations into Italian and the Slavic tongues see Hans Rost, *Die Bibel im Mittelalter* (Augsburg, 1939), 376-78.

14 Compare S. L. Greenslade, *The Work of William Tindale with an essay by C. D. Bone comparing the translations of More and Tindale* (London, 1938).

15 See the articles by Douen in the appendix of volume I of Ferdinand Buisson, *Sébastien Castellion* (Paris, 1892).

through the doctors of the Middle Ages by Holzhey,<sup>16</sup> but the monographs devoted to the views of individuals are numerous. Luther's attitude to the authority of Scripture is crucial and puzzling. The key lies in his Christology. A word of Christ he dared not tamper with however irrational it might appear, but with Christology as a touchstone he could move otherwise through the Bible with royal freedom. He was quite ready to discard traditional views of authorship, though not to reject from the canon anything beyond the Old Testament Apocrypha.<sup>17</sup> Calvin, too, though more systematic and sober than Luther, was no narrow Biblical literalist. He, too, would relinquish traditional theories of authorship, yet stoutly rejected Castellio's attempt to expunge the Song of Solomon from the canon.<sup>18</sup> Paternity for the doctrine of verbal inspiration in Protestantism has usually been assigned to Matthias Flacius Illyricus, but this view has just been contested by Moldaenke.<sup>19</sup> Yet Flacius certainly did talk sometimes in terms of verbal inspiration.<sup>20</sup> The controversy in the Reformation period over the relative authority of the outer and the inner word, so dear to the Protestant sectaries, has been well covered by Maronier and Grützmacher.<sup>21</sup>

Biblical criticism, whether higher or lower, was not far advanced in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and what there was has not been adequately canvassed. Luigi Pulci mocked some of the Old Testament miracles. Lorenzo Valla raised problems with regard to the text. Erasmus at first rejected the 'three witness' passage. Michael Servetus was critical of the current typological interpretation of the Old Testament as foreshadowing Christ. Carlstadt attacked the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch,<sup>22</sup> and Francis David, the Antitrinitarian,

<sup>16</sup> Karl Holzhey, *Die Inspiration der hl. Schrift* (München, 1895).

<sup>17</sup> Paul Schempp, "Luthers Stellung zur heiligen Schrift", *Forsch. zur Gesch. und Lehre des Prot.*, III (1929), stresses the Christological interest, but neglects the older literature. This can be found by consulting Schottenloher under "Luther" and then under "Schriftprinzip." Luther's early lectures on Romans and Hebrews have been made available in critical editions in the series *Anfänge reformatorischer Bibelauslegung*, edited by Johannes Ficker.

<sup>18</sup> See J. A. Cramer, *De heilige Schrift bij Calvijn* (Utrecht, 1906).

<sup>19</sup> Günter Moldaenke, "Schriftverständnis und Schriftdeutung im Zeitalter der Reformation. Teil I. Matthias Flacius Illyricus." *Forsch. z. Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte*, IX (1936).

<sup>20</sup> See *Church History*, VII (1938), 183.

<sup>21</sup> J. H. Maronier, *Het Inwendig Woord* (Amsterdam, 1890). Richard H. Grützmacher, *Wort und Geist* (Leipzig, 1902).

<sup>22</sup> His tract on the canon is reprinted by Karl August Credner, *Zur Geschichte des Canons* (Halle, 1847).

questioned the genuineness of the command, "Go ye into all the world and baptize all nations in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost."<sup>23</sup>

The Biblical commentaries of the Reformation are an inexhaustible mine not only for religious but also for political and social ideas. If Baron is looking for the sources of Calvinist republicanism, he is driven to Bucer's commentary on Judges.<sup>24</sup> If one desires a ready touchstone to views about religious liberty the key passages under which to look are Deuteronomy 13 and Titus 2,10. The parable of the tares is the clue to the theory of the church and its relations to the states, because the sectaries identified the tares with the heretics who were not to be weeded out, whereas the representatives of the established order saw the tares in moral offenders only.<sup>25</sup> Certain passages of Scripture in fact constituted rubrics under which to discuss all manner of topics. Suicide would go under Samson; theft under the despoiling of the Egyptians; bigamy under Lamech and polygamy under Abraham or some other patriarch; Judith was the figure for tyrannicide; pacifism and the rejection of the oath of course went back to the Sermon on the Mount, and the stock passage for Christian recognition of the state was always Romans 13. The proof text for the contract theory of government was II Kings 11:17.

The problem of the relation of the New Testament to the Old had long troubled Christian exegetes. The difficulty was in part that the church rejected the Jewish law but canonized the book which contained the law. A deeper discrepancy appeared when the church on making its peace with the empire filled up the gaps in a deficient political ethic out of the Old Testament despite its divergence from the Sermon on the Mount. Calvinism in particular did this in the age of the Reformation, even going to the length of reviving the tyrannicide of Judith. And the Münsterites brought back the polygamy of the patriarchs. No little discussion in consequence arose as to the relation of the new dispensation to the old.<sup>26</sup>

23 Matthew 28:19. Frederick W. Farrar's *History of Interpretation* (New York, 1886), though still useful in its way, by no means covers all of this territory.

24 Hans Baron, "Calvinist Republicanism," *Church History*, VIII (1939), 30-42.

25 See my article, "The Parables of the Tares," *Church History*, I (1932), 67-89.

26 See my article, "The Immoralities of the Patriarchs," *Harvard Theological Review*, XXIII (1930), 39-49.

The Biblical commentary of the common man was the drama and the picture book. A bibliography of the dramatizations of the Bible all the way from the mysteries to the present has been prepared by Coleman,<sup>27</sup> and Philip Schmidt has pointed out that Biblical illustration is valuable not only as art but also as exegesis.<sup>28</sup>

The primary need in this whole field is for a comprehensive work covering all aspects of the subject. Less tangible but ultimately more important would be a realization on the part of scholars in related areas of the stores of relevant material deposited in Biblical commentaries. Particularly is this true of social and political thought, and even theologians have not always been aware that Luther's theology can better be gleaned from his commentaries on Psalms, Romans, and Genesis than from more direct treatises.

27 Edward D. Coleman, *The Bible in English Drama* (New York, 1931). Attention may be called also to Erwin Kohler, "Entwicklung des biblischen Dramas des 16 Jhr. in Frankreich." (Diss., Naumburg, a. S., 1911). Joseph Herrlich, "Das englische Bibeldrama zur Zeit der Renaissance und Reformation." (Diss., München, 1907), which gives particular attention to Udall, but adds bibliography on Bale, Buchanan, etc. Ernst Nahde, "Der reiche Mann und der arme Lazarus." (Diss., Jena, 1928), adds bibliography on works treating the dramatization of Susanna, the Prodigal, Esther and Tobias. Cf. also Archer Taylor, *Problems in German Lit. History*, 108-9. Joseph E. Gillett, "The German dramatist of the sixteenth century and his Bible," *Publ. Mod. Lang. Ass.*, XXXIV (1919), 465-93.

28 Philip Schmidt, "Die Bibelillustrationen als Laienexegese," *Festschrift Gustav Benz* (Basel, 1935), 228-39. A guide in general to the Biblical illustrating of the period will be found under the caption "*Bibelausstattung*" in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*.

## THE CROMWELLIAN ESTABLISHMENT

ETHYN W. KIRBY

*Providence, Rhode Island*

In 1652 John Milton reminded Cromwell that the chief end for which the Civil War had been fought—to gain religious liberty—had not yet been attained:

New foes arise,  
Threatening to bind our souls with secular chains.  
Help us to save free conscience from the paw  
Of hireling wolves, whose Gospel is their maw.

Yet, despite the fervor of Milton's plea, it was plain to the clear-sighted Englishman in the early 1650's that by far the greater threat to religion was the lack of order and government in the church. Thus, when Cromwell became Lord Protector in 1653 no problem seemed graver than that of restoring order in the church. He must furthermore do this in such a way as to keep the support of all the sects. The ship of state must be carefully steered between the Scylla of intolerance and the Charybdis of ecclesiastical disorder.

Though there was legally a successor to the old prelatical system, it was a ramshackle affair. The presbyterian polity had been introduced, but it existed only where the clergy were powerful enough to form a classis—and even where it existed it did not include all the ministers in that area. The Directory, which had displaced the Book of Common Prayer, was not universally used. Because of the quarrel over who had the power of excommunication, the sacrament of the Eucharist was seldom administered. As for baptism, the scruples of the Calvinist over who should be baptized, and the refusal of the Baptists to administer the rite to any except godly adults, had meant that even that sacrament was no longer given as a matter of course.

The sermon, which earlier in the century the Puritans had exalted as a means of grace, persisted, but even its sacerdotal character had been largely lost. For when every cobbler



and every tinker—and, worse still, every woman—felt himself or herself competent to preach the word of God, what virtue lay in ordination? And, indeed, what virtue did lie in ordination? The moderate clergymen, that is, the Presbyterians, the Independents, and the Baptists, might carefully recruit their ranks from godly youth, but their orders were not recognized by Anglicans or by the radical sectaries.

This established church, however, did not purport to include all Englishmen. Thus it differed from the Anglican establishment, in which every person of the age to be confirmed might partake of the Holy Communion. But in this new Genevan establishment only the elect were permitted to partake of this rite. This had led to the excommunication of many. And besides those who were excommunicated as not godly, there were those who voluntarily excommunicated themselves. The Independents; the Baptists; the Quakers, who regarded all rites and all creeds as wrong; the Muggletonians and the Ranters, the Behmenists and the Seekers, the Libertines and the Familists, the Fifth Monarchy Men, and the Unitarians, besides the followers of strange new prophets—Sir Henry Vane, Dr. Gibbon, Dr. Gell, and Mr. Parker—all these new sects, some containing only a few members and others constantly growing in strength, remained outside the establishment and lifted their voices in protest against presbyterian principles.<sup>1</sup>

Then, too, there were the Anglicans, or the Prelatists as Richard Baxter called them. How many there were is not clear. Undoubtedly many who were at heart Anglicans conformed outwardly to the new state church, but sought out a nobleman's chaplain nearby when baptism or marriage was concerned. In some parishes the Anglican incumbent had succeeded in staying on during the ejections of the 1640's; this he had been able to do because of the connivance of his patron and parishioners. At any rate, the conduct of the

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Edwards, *Gangraena* (London, 1646) is, of course, a highly exaggerated account; see the sermons of Edmund Calamy and Anthony Farringdon for protests against the rise of the sectaries; and Richard Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae* (London, 1696), I, 74-79; John Gauden, *Ecclesiae Anglicanae Suspiria* (London, 1659), 48, 162-176; and the modern account, based on a wealth of source material, by Robert Barclay, *Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth* (London, 1876), are valuable as reflecting different points of view. For the Baptist sect, see L. F. Brown, *Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men* (Washington, 1912).

Cavalier Parliament in the 1660's was evidence that a generation hostile to Anglicanism had not grown up.

As for the Roman Catholics, they persisted in their secret ways, their priests benefitting by the chaotic conditions. But Anglicans and Roman Catholics were tainted by their devotion to the exiled Stuarts and might be disregarded by the new government. Not so could the sectaries, who, after all, had brought Cromwell into power and who must be propitiated if he were to stay in power.

The question was what would Cromwell do with the church? Because the Long Parliament had been weak, the sectaries had flourished at the expense of the establishment. With the creation of a strong executive in 1653, it seemed possible that an equally strong church might be settled.

But how could Cromwell reconcile such a policy with his often-repeated declarations of toleration? His pronouncements on this subject during the 1640's are, of course, too well known to need a detailed discussion.<sup>2</sup> As early as 1644 he had expressed himself as favoring "a libertie for all religions without any exceptions." Whether he really meant all religions is doubtful, for he was at that time fighting with pious zeal the Anglicans and Roman Catholics in the king's army, whose extermination he regarded as a godly deed. The Independents and the Baptists in his army, who prayed, preached, and fought with equal fervor, came to represent to him true piety. It was of them that he thought when in 1647 as army spokesman he urged that "every good citizen, and every man that walks peaceably in a blameless conversation, and is beneficial to the Commonwealth, may have liberty and encouragement." But at the same time he disavowed "licentious liberty, under pretence of obtaining ease for tender consciences."

How broad a toleration he really favored is not clear, but from his speeches and letters before 1653 he emerges as a man far more tolerant than many other deeply religious men of his time. Yet there are important qualifications in his views that we must not lose sight of. He was a sound Calvinist. Paradoxically he was an Independent, and so favored the gathered congregation, and he was an Erastian in so far as he

<sup>2</sup> See W. C. Abbott, *Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell* (2 vols., Cambridge, 1937 and 1939), and W. K. Jordan, *The Development of Religious Toleration in England, 1640-1660* (Cambridge, 1938), 54-55, 56, 98, *et passim*.

advocated the duty of the state to maintain order in the church.

The principles of the church which he was to establish were set forth in the Instrument of Government. The Christian religion, as contained in the Bible, was to be "the public profession of these Nations," and provision was to be made for its maintenance. But no one was to be forced to attend the established church. All who "profess[ed] Faith in God by Jesus Christ" were permitted to worship separately so long as they did not disturb the public peace or the worship of others. There were, also, important omissions. This liberty was not given to "Popery, or Prelacy, nor to such, as under the Profession of Christ, hold forth and practice Licentiousness." Anglicans, Roman Catholics, and Familists or Libertines were thus grouped together as non-tolerable. The Anglicans, it has been said in extenuation of Cromwell's thus violating tolerant principles, were excluded because of their royalists sympathies. Yet it cannot be overlooked that the Presbyterian clergy had made no secret of their royalist leanings; they had protested against the execution of Charles I and had prayed for the rightful ruler across the seas. Cromwell evidently had hopes of winning their support, whereas he knew the Anglicans could never be reconciled. Thus at the very first tolerance was set aside for reasons of state.

This new establishment, as set forth in the Instrument of Government, was thus a vague, indeed a negative, thing. How strong it was to be, how tolerant it was to be, depended upon Cromwell.

While the Instrument of Government may be regarded in the main as the work of Lambert, the religious establishment reflects the influence of John Owen, as well as of Cromwell. Because of the close friendship which had existed between Cromwell and Owen since 1649 it may not be amiss to describe the circumstances under which they met.

Owen had begun life as a Puritan clergyman, but by 1646 he had become an Independent. In January, 1649, when Cromwell first heard him preach, Owen, who was then only thirty-three years old and thus younger than the Westminster Assembly members, presented clearly and pontifically a religious policy. He warned his hearers (he was preaching to Parliament) that they must uphold "the Order of the Gospel, and

the administration of the Ordinances of Christ," but he advised them that they must do this in such a way as to permit freedom of worship.

He did, to be sure, limit this toleration. Roman Catholics and blasphemers were excluded, as well as those who disturbed "civil society" or worshippers, or who like vagrants wandered about preaching unorthodox beliefs, or who by a "pretence of religion" drew men to sin. Thus, he barred Roman Catholics, Quakers, and the whole left wing of dissent from toleration.<sup>3</sup>

This sermon appealed to Cromwell. It rejected the use of force in the world of the spirit, but at the same time it recognized the importance of the magistrate. While advocating tolerance, it protested against disorder. It is no wonder that after this sermon Cromwell declared to Owen, "You are the person I must be acquainted with."<sup>4</sup>

From this time on the two men were closely associated. To Owen, indeed, is ascribed the authorship of certain proposals for church government, drawn up in 1652, which were to have definite influence upon the Cromwellian establishment. These proposals, it will be recalled, were worked out by a committee composed of members of the Long Parliament, including Cromwell, and Owen and other clergymen. Incidentally, at a meeting of this committee Cromwell made his memorable remark that he would rather tolerate Mohammedanism than run the risk of persecuting "one of God's children." He was, of course, quite safe in making this assertion, for it was unlikely that he would be called upon to permit a mosque being built in Lincoln's Inn Fields and, anyway, he undoubtedly had his own ideas about who "God's children" were. But the remark probably had the effect of checking the intolerance of those who, as Milton feared, yearned to mangle tender consciences.

At any rate, from this committee came the proposals for a church establishment which were to be adopted, with some modifications, in 1654. In many respects the original plan

3 John Owen, *Sermons* (London, 1721), 269-317. The political aspects of this sermon are also significant, for Owen appeared before the Parliament at a time when the Presbyterian clergymen were drawing up their fiery protest against the execution of Charles I.

4 S. R. Gardiner, *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate* (3 vols., London, 1894-1903), III, 27.

was more liberal than that of 1654. It called, as did the latter scheme, for two bodies: the ejectors, who were, as their name implied, to expel ungodly ministers, and the triers, who were to admit qualified ministers. Both lay and clerical members were to sit in the two groups. Tolerated sects were to meet without hindrance in places of worship known to the magistrates; but the provision which refused permission to preach to all who denied "those principles of Christian religion, without the acknowledgment whereof the Scriptures plainly affirm that salvation is not to be obtained," clearly barred from toleration Quakers and Unitarians. There was no provision excluding Anglicans or Roman Catholics from toleration.<sup>5</sup>

When in 1654 Cromwell set up the establishment ordered by the Instrument of Government, he used this scheme. In March his ordinance created a commission of triers. As for patronage, while it remained with the lay patrons or with the Protector and Council of State, the incumbent must receive the approval of these triers. In August was established the commission of ejectors, to cleanse the church of "malignant" ministers.

A study of the commission of triers reveals a great deal about Cromwell's attitude toward the church. In the first place, he aimed to create a Puritan national church, composed of the three moderate sects, Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists. He regarded these three sects as so nearly akin that they should be able to work together. One of his first acts as Protector, indeed, had been to call to him leaders of these sects to point out to them that they must co-operate.<sup>6</sup> His speeches throughout the 1650's echo this idea: that these sects by working together could advance the kingdom of God on earth. In the second place, Cromwell favored a church in which laymen had power; and so, he placed on the two commissions laymen as well as clergymen of these sects.

This commission of triers also is significant as showing that the more liberal clergymen of the period were willing to co-operate with other sectaries. Their exclusiveness was being broken. For when the Presbyterian admitted the Independent and the Baptist to sit with him to pass on ministers'

<sup>5</sup> Gardiner, *History*, II, 28-29.

<sup>6</sup> Mary T. Blauvelt, *Oliver Cromwell* (New York, 1937), 225.



qualifications, he recognized their orders, their dogma, and their polity as being not heretical but equal to those of Geneva.

The fourteen Independent clergymen who sat on the commission of triers were its strongest members. Three of the famous five who had fought so hard in the Westminster Assembly against Presbyterian tyranny, were included, while John Owen, Nicholas Lockyer, Hugh Peter, and Peter Sterry represented the liberal group who were part of Cromwell's household.<sup>7</sup>

The Baptist clergymen on the commission were John Tombes, Daniel Dyke, and Henry Jessey, who belonged to the Calvinist, or Particular, Baptists. Tombes was a noted controversialist and was regarded by Baxter as one of the chief disseminators of "the infection of Anabaptism." The Baptists were strongly represented among the lay-commissioners.

It is the Presbyterian members who best illustrate Cromwell's point of view. The men who were omitted are as significant as those named. Edmund Calamy, Matthew Newcomen, William Spurstowe—those stalwart leaders of the 1640's—were probably left out because of their attacks on tolerance. Thomas Manton and Stephen Marshall were of a more conciliatory nature; Marshall's sermon, in 1653, in which he pleaded for an end to destructive divisions in the church, probably won for him his place on the commission.<sup>8</sup>

The ordinance which created the commission of triers was vague about the qualifications of the candidate. He must possess the "grace of God," be given to "holy and unblameable conversation," and be able to preach the Gospel. As to his doctrine nothing was said. While the approval of five triers was necessary to admit a clergyman, none could be disapproved

<sup>7</sup> The list is given in Jordan, *Religious Toleration*, 157n. Mr. Jordan says that there were only ten Independents, but it is clear that Thankful Owen, Samuel Slater, Walter Cradock (often classified as a Baptist), Joseph Caryl, William Carter, William Greenhill, and William Strong should be classed with the Independent members of the commission.

<sup>8</sup> Manton's and Marshall's views on toleration are ably summarized in Jordan, *Religious Toleration*, 321, 323-324, 328-331. For Marshall's views in 1653 see *The Power of the civil Magistrate in matters of religion . . .* (London, 1657), 19, 26-27. Although Marshall did not join with other Presbyterian ministers in 1649 to protest against the execution of Charles I, Giles Firmin in *The Question between the Conformist and the Nonconformist stated* (London, 1681) defended Marshall from charges that he had favored it. During the 1660's and 1670's Manton was to be the leading Presbyterian in the negotiations with Anglicans for the inclusion of Presbyterians in the church.

unless nine commissioners were present. There was no provision for ordination.

It was evidently the intention of those who framed the Instrument of Government that righteousness of life and a definite vocation were to be the criteria. In practice, it seems, the meetings of the commissioners and the candidates often became quibbling disputes, with questions which probed deeply into the candidates' beliefs.<sup>9</sup> And because the triers were Calvinists, they not unnaturally tended to approve only candidates of that school of dogma. Baxter declared that they were too lax about Antinomianism and too severe towards Arminianism; this charge was echoed by the Arminian John Goodwin, who declared that the triers were more severe and unjust than the bishops had been.<sup>10</sup> Carlyle, carried away by his fanatical enthusiasm for Cromwell, called the triers "The acknowledged Flower of Spiritual England,"<sup>11</sup> but certainly any group which failed to include Henry More, Jeremy Taylor, or Edward Reynolds does not deserve such high praise. The commissioners were undoubtedly able, conscientious men, united by their hatred of Anglicanism—for only one of them conformed in 1662—and by their zeal for Calvinism.<sup>12</sup>

The triers, of course, acted only to approve clergy who were to hold benefices or lectureships in the established church. They had no authority over those already holding livings. These incumbents must be approved by the commission of ejectors. This body, it must be noted, was chosen by Parliament, not by Cromwell, although the Council later added more clergymen to the list.<sup>13</sup> The grounds for ejection were specifically enumerated and ranged from scandalous life to use of the Book of Common Prayer, from disaffection to the government to the encouraging of may-poles.

From the membership of these two commissions it is clear that Cromwell planned a union of the three moderate sects

<sup>9</sup> John Walker, . . . *Sufferings of the Clergy* . . . (London, 1714), 175-177.

<sup>10</sup> *Rel. Baxt.*, I, 72; Daniel Neal, *History of the Puritans* (3 vols., London, 1837), II, 627.

<sup>11</sup> Thomas Carlyle, *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches* (3 vols., ed by C. S. Lomas, New York, 1904), II, 386.

<sup>12</sup> Thomas Horton, a Presbyterian member, was the only conformist in the group; several of them died before 1662, and of that number it is quite possible that Marshall, at least, would have returned to Anglicanism.

<sup>13</sup> The ordinances creating the two commissions are given in Firth and Rait, *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum* (3 vols., London, 1911), II, 855-858, 968-990; see also *Cal. S. P. Dom.*, 1656-1657, p. 65.

in one state-supported church. Whether he hoped for a definite organic union is not clear. At any rate his intention was to unite them in the bonds of Christian charity so that their bickerings and strife would end and those outside these sects would be brought into closer fellowship with them.

The vagueness of the terms of the Instrument of Government concerning the establishment would be remedied, it was intended, by acts of Parliament. Whether Cromwell intended Parliament to formulate a creed for the new national church is not clear. His speeches of September fourth and twelfth warned the members against undue severity in matters of conscience, but made no particular recommendations as to the way in which Parliament should proceed. One thing was clear, and that was that he had no intention of allowing blasphemy and "carnal divisions" in the kingdom. Peaceable men were to be allowed to worship as their consciences dictated. "Visible miscarriages," by which he evidently meant the attacks made by Quakers and Fifth Monarchy Men upon other sectaries, he declared, should be punished by the magistrate.<sup>14</sup>

Parliament, however, proceeded to formulate a creed for the new establishment. A committee of clergymen, representing the three moderate sects, helped them in their deliberations: Thomas Goodwin, Owen, Caryl, Simpson, Fairclough, Marshall, Manton, Vynes, Reynolds, Jessey, and Dyke—all shades of thought except the extreme Presbyterian view were represented. "You may wonder at this miscellany," wrote a member of the House of Commons to Baxter, "but it was thought fitt to have men of severall interests and judgments."<sup>15</sup>

When the clergymen presented Parliament with a list of twenty fundamentals of the Christian faith, the House of Commons failed to approve the new creed. Whether Cromwell was behind its action is not known; that he had not directed them to formulate a creed is clear. It may be regarded as evidence that Parliament at heart favored some doctrinal basis for the new establishment that it did ask the ministers to present a statement of "such doctrinal truths as they conceive fit to be owned by such Ministers as shall receive the

<sup>14</sup> Carlyle, *Cromwell's Letters*, II, 343-348.

<sup>15</sup> Baxter MSS, Dr. Williams Library, Vol. III, Letters, folio 169. Baxter later joined this committee.

public Maintenance."<sup>16</sup> These "doctrinal truths" were not accepted by Parliament either. They are, however, of interest as showing the broad-mindedness of the committee which drew them up. Avoiding the Calvinistic doctrines of election and reprobation, they emphasized the basic truths which could be assented to by all except Unitarians and the more extreme Quakers.<sup>17</sup>

Parliament, undeterred by its failure to have a creed drawn up, was engaged in defining heresy when Cromwell suddenly dissolved it on January 22, 1655. Possibly he was angered at its indecision as to who should determine heresy, possibly he felt that it was encroaching upon his prerogative, possibly he disapproved of its quibbling. At any rate in a fiery speech he explained his dream of a national church and rebuked Parliament because it had failed to help him achieve it. "Such good and wholesome provisions . . . for the settling of such matters in things of Religion," he told them, should have been made "as would have upheld and given Countenance to a godly Ministry," and yet would have given "a just liberty to men of different judgments." He spoke with approval of the godly sects—the Independents and "many under the form of Baptism," and, by implication, the Presbyterians, but he failed to make clear whether he had intended Parliament to provide freedom of worship only for them or for all peaceable folk.

Toleration, he admitted, must be limited. "Profane persons, blasphemers, such as preach sedition; the contentious revilers, evil speakers"—these should be punished. Yet he insisted that men in "disputable things" should be left to "their own consciences." The Instrument of Government, he claimed, had made due provision for toleration, and Parliament should have proceeded along these lines.<sup>18</sup>

Now that Parliament had failed (as he felt) to provide for the government of the new national church, Cromwell proceeded to rule it according to his own ideas, vague as they were. He was, of course, aided by the two commissions and,

<sup>16</sup> *Commons Journals*, VII, 395.

<sup>17</sup> Published by Philip Nye, S. Simpson, and others as *The Principles of Faith* (London, 1654). This *credo* is so much more liberal than the Savoy Confession of the Independents of 1658 that it is possible that Manton, Marshall, and Baxter drew it up.

<sup>18</sup> Carlyle, *Cromwell's Letters*, II, 416-419.

in 1655-1656, by the Major-Generals, but he was the supreme authority. Not only had he taken over the right of appointment to livings which the king and bishops and cathedral chapters had formerly disposed of, but if the lay impropriator did not fill a vacancy within two months, Cromwell could fill it. His was the final word as to who should, or should not, be ejected. Groups desirous of forming congregations appealed to him for places in which to worship.

A great many clergy seem to have been ejected during these years. While no creed, no liturgy, no XXXIX Articles bound men's consciences, a new standard had been created. Loyalty to the new government was the first thing demanded of a clergyman. The royalist uprising of 1655 made suspect those Anglican clergymen who had survived the ejections of the 1640's and 1654, and toward them the ejectors and the Major-Generals acted with severity. The mere use of the Book of Common Prayer was enough to guarantee the expulsion of a clergyman, no matter how able he was. There were, of course, exceptions. Petitions to Cromwell and his Council seem sometimes to have resulted in an Anglican retaining his living or his chaplaincy, but these were exceptions. And connivance is not toleration. For, if Cromwell was vague at times about his newly established church, he was very certain about the old establishment. He hated bishops—his first speech in Parliament had shown that, and he evidently had no love for the Book of Common Prayer. He failed to realize that refusal to allow the use of the prayer book might be as intolerant as to insist upon its use.

Nevertheless, it is possible that by 1656 he may have sympathized with the bishops and their zeal for uniformity. At any rate, he had come to realize that the most he could do was to "preserve the balance between the sects," so that one would not tyrannize over the others. For he had seen the difficulty of maintaining an establishment in which three sects, supposedly equal as far as rights were concerned, tried to dominate each other. It had been intended that all the people (except, of course, for the tolerated groups which were to meet apart) should worship in the parish churches under the pastorate of an Independent, a Baptist, or a Presbyterian, as the case might be. This pastor was to be supported by tithes. But this plan,



simple as it appeared, gave rise to a host of problems. There was the question of what was to be done in a parish where a minority refused to accept the incumbent, but demanded the use of the church for their own services. Cromwell and his Council got around that difficulty by ordering that the minority group should use the edifice when the regular incumbent was not holding services. But how was the pastor of this separatist group to be paid? And who was to maintain the church fabric? Sometimes, indeed, the separatist group refused to use the church building, and met in houses or in a place provided by the magistrates.<sup>19</sup>

When the protesting minority, or even the majority, were Anglicans, as happened in Baxter's parish in Kidderminster for instance,<sup>20</sup> they were made churchless. As the 1650's wore on the laws became more severe so that the Anglicans were harried in a fashion which helps to explain the excesses which followed the Restoration. They were fined two shillings sixpence for failure to attend church. Now, a Presbyterian, an Independent, or a Baptist might—and did—protest to the Council against such a fine, but the Anglican, if he did so, only made more evident his royalist sympathies. How rigidly this law about church attendance was enforced cannot be discovered. Probably its enforcement depended upon the temper of the magistrate.

Another problem in this new establishment was what was to be done with the clergyman who refused to be ejected. Cromwell and his Council tried to cope with that by issuing a proclamation, on July 3, 1655, which declared that those who refused to leave should be deprived of that fifth of their income to which the ejected incumbents were entitled by law and should then be prosecuted as "disturbers of the peace."<sup>21</sup> Examination of the minutes of Council meetings, as preserved in the Calendars of State Papers for these years, shows that the government did try to be just. Upon appeal, the ejected clergyman might have his case reviewed. Intent as Cromwell was upon ridding the church of intriguing royalists, he evidently

19 *Cal. S. P. Dom.*, 1655, pp. 61, 68; 1655-1656, pp. 224, 342, *et passim*. See W. A. Shaw, *History of the English Church, 1640-1660* (2 vols., New York, 1900), II, 132-134, and Mary Coate, *Cornwall in the Great Civil War and Interregnum* (Oxford, 1933), 322-350.

20 *Rel. Bxt.*, I, 91; see also *Cal. S. P. Dom.*, 1655-1656, p. 383.

21 *Cal. S. P. Dom.*, 1654-1655, p. 224.

did not wish that a clergyman quietly doing his duty should be ejected.

For Cromwell intended his ecclesiastical policy to be one of "healing and settling." Were the emphasis laid upon only the fundamental principles upon which the sectaries agreed, he hoped that the reign of the saints might be introduced. But the difficulty was that the saints refused to be saints. When a liberal like Richard Baxter spoke of the "infection of Anabaptism," it is evident that a comprehensive church could not be built up. Indeed, Cromwell never realized how widely separated were the Independents, the Presbyterians, and the Baptists; for the clergymen who had overlooked their differences and worked together in his commissions represented but a small minority of the ministers of the nation.

He overlooked, also, the fact that, after all, the sects had separated from the Anglican church not because it was too narrow, but because it was not narrow enough. The Puritans at the Hampton Court Conference (just as the Puritans at the Savoy Conference were to do in the 1660's) wished the Anglican church made more purely Calvinistic; the Independents had dreamed of a church composed only of the saints; the Baptists regarded infant baptism as sinful. And now the sects clung the more closely to their separatism because it was the thing for which they had been fighting.

Had Cromwell been more firmly established in power, he might have come in time to adopt a truly tolerant policy, by which Anglicans and Quakers and Fifth Monarchy Men, no matter what their political beliefs were, might worship as freely as Baptists or Independents. But he was, after all, an interloper. As the 1650's wore on, Cromwell and his Council, and Parliament too, became more conservative. It was not, it must be pointed out, that Cromwell became more intolerant, but that he realized that tolerance did not work. It must be pointed out, too, that Quakers and Fifth Monarchy Men were punished not on religious grounds, but on political grounds, just as the repressive measures against the Anglicans were directed against them as royalists. For Cromwell had come to regard church and state as one. Just as in the 1640's the victories of his Ironsides had shown him that religious zeal and military obedience were the same thing, now he regarded

any one who questioned authority in church or in state as ungodly. There could be no godliness, he declared in 1657, unless a man was "honestly and quietly disposed to live within rules of Government." "I reckon," he went so far as to say, "no Godliness without this circle, but without this spirit let it pretend what it will, it is diabolical, it is devilish, it is from diabolical spirits, from the height of Satan's wickedness."<sup>22</sup> Laud or Montague had not better voiced the duty of non-resistance. Church and state were one, and Cromwell was master of both.

His establishment was assailed from all sides. Quakers and Fifth Monarchy Men, of course, used all the opprobrious terms in the Bible to describe Cromwell and his régime. But even conservative and liberal Presbyterians attacked it. Edmund Calamy, representing the right-wing of the Presbyterian party, rebuked Cromwell soundly for the religious chaos which prevailed in 1654. Ministers, citizens, and government officials, he declared, had disregarded religion in order to serve their own interests.<sup>23</sup> Richard Baxter criticized the new establishment because of its vagueness, and declared that the government was fomenting divisions in order to keep itself in power. To check the decline of religion he urged that the right of preaching be limited to those who were officially appointed.<sup>24</sup> It is no wonder that Cromwell, in an interview following this sermon, seemed angry at Baxter; although Baxter in his *Autobiography* has given the impression that it was the catholicity of his views to which the Protector objected.<sup>25</sup> By 1657, Baxter complained that because of the government's laxness the heresies of Quakers, Papists, and Antinomians had grown unchecked. He called for firmer discipline.<sup>26</sup>

Even Edward Reynolds, one of the noblest advocates of church unity, saw with dismay the godless condition of his country. "In how unsettled and discomposed a condition the Church of God is," he lamented; "the holy ordinances of Christ by multitudes quite forsaken, the holy truth of Christ by many corrupted with . . . heresy and blasphemy."<sup>27</sup> Clergymen

<sup>22</sup> Carlyle, *Cromwell's Letters*, III, 66.

<sup>23</sup> Calamy, *The Monster of Sinful Self-Seeking Anatomized* . . . (London, 1655).

<sup>24</sup> Baxter, *Humble Advice* . . . (London, 1655), 1.

<sup>25</sup> *Rel. Bart.*, II, 205.

<sup>26</sup> Baxter, *Catholick Unity* . . . (London, 1660), 37, 65.

<sup>27</sup> Edward Reynolds, *Works* (6 vols., London, 1826), IV, 447-448.

blamed the magistrates for the weakness of the church, while one pointed out that it was a poor return for the mercies which God had showered upon the people in the 1640's at Newbury and elsewhere that the magistrates had failed to set up "a pure worship and ordinances . . . amongst us."<sup>28</sup> Even Hugh Peter in 1658 rebuked Parliament for the lack of religious zeal displayed by the magistrates.<sup>29</sup>

Cromwell's ideal of a Puritan church was thus never achieved. In the first place, it failed because it was based upon a mutual forbearance for which the nation was not ready. His establishment failed, in the second place, because it was founded upon a Calvinist theology; for the doctrine that only the elect constitute the church cannot be reconciled with a national church. The Long Parliament had imposed a presbyterian government upon a non-Presbyterian nation, while Cromwell's national church, even if it did not maintain this polity, had as its basis the idea of the reign of the elect, with tolerance for some and an intermittent connivance for the ungodly.

Yet if Cromwell failed to create a strong national church, he did nevertheless achieve a toleration relatively broad in scope. If the Roman Catholics, the Anglicans, the Quakers, and the Fifth Monarchy Men were persecuted, it was on political grounds, rather than religious. Nevertheless there were important flaws in his policy. The expulsion of Anglican clergymen from the livings which they held legally, the ban on the use of the Book of Common Prayer, could not be justified on the grounds of Christian charity for which Cromwell continually pleaded. The wide toleration which he advocated had to be sacrificed for reasons of state.

28 Matthew Barker, *The Faithful and Wise Servant* . . . (London, 1657); William Jenkyns, *The Policy of Princes* . . . (London, 1656); Thomas Jacombe, *The Active and Publick Spirit* . . . (London, 1657). A comparison of the tone of these sermons with those of the 1640's makes it clear that the abolition of the episcopacy had not brought about that universal godliness which the bishops' enemies had predicted in the early 1640's. Indeed, it is quite likely that the chaotic state of the church in the 1640's and 1650's had quite as much to do with the restoration of the bishops as the popular enthusiasm for Charles II had.

29 Thomas Burton, *Parliamentary Diary* (4 vols., London, 1828), II, 346-7.

## JOHN HALES AND THE PURITANS DURING THE MARIAN EXILE

GEORGE T. PECK

*Chicago, Illinois*

John Hales's life during the Marian Exile throws much light on the development of that Puritan group which came back to England in 1558 and helped to found the Elizabethan church in the chaos left from the Roman Catholic reaction of Queen Mary. While Bishop Ponet and John Knox were formulating the political credo of the later Puritan party, Hales was working out his "congregational experiment" in the field of practical politics at Frankfort.

His early career had been full enough for two ordinary men. Born of a minor gentry family of Kent,<sup>2</sup> Hales educated himself and earned a position with his successful uncle, Sir Christopher Hales, who rose to the office of Attorney General in 1529.<sup>3</sup> Until 1535, the young man learned the legal profession in this job and must have witnessed the great trials of Wolsey, Ann Boleyn, More, and Fisher. But he tired of the slow rate of advancement, and on application to the Master of the Rolls, Thomas Cromwell, he was employed as a collector of ecclesiastical taxes<sup>4</sup> and aided his superior in the dissolution of the monasteries.<sup>5</sup>

1 Marshall M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism* (Chicago, 1939), 149-160.

2 His father was an alderman of Canterbury. John Burke, *Extinct and Dormant Baronetcies of England* (London, 1838), 232; and William Berry, *County Genealogies, Kent* (London, 1830). The family manor at High Halden is described by Edward Haste, *Historical and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent, II*, (Canterbury, 1782), 140.

3 *Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 1917- ); Sir Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, (London, 1721), I, 176 and 404. John Hales's legal learning is attested by these writers and is shown in his "Oration in Commendation of Laws" of 1542, *Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic of Henry VIII* (22 vols.; London, 1862-1929), XVII, 706, App. no. 1.

4 The application is in *Original Letters Illustrative of English History*, ed. by Sir Henry Ellis, (3rd ser.; 4 vols.; London, 1846), II, 349. Hales first got minor jobs; then in 1537 he was made Clerk of the First Fruits for England and Wales, see the patent in *Henry VIII Papers*, XII, Part I, 250, no. 539.

5 He broke up "the papisticall denne of idle and unlearned beasts at Soulbie;" Ellis, *Original Letters*, III, 228, a letter to Thomas Cromwell of Sept. 25, 1538.



Like so many other satellites of Chancellor Cromwell, Hales not only rose in the governmental bureaucracy, but made a great deal of money in the process. Between the years 1538 and 1545, he acquired four large tracts of ecclesiastical property in Coventry. The first "purchase" was of the old Carmelite monastery, which was renamed Hales Place and became his residence;<sup>6</sup> the second consisted of many of the lands of the great Priory of Coventry, which brought in a net income of about £500;<sup>7</sup> the third, St. John's Hospital, brought an income of about £65; and the last, Stonely Graunge, a farm near the city, was worth about the same.<sup>8</sup> The loss sustained by the city from the cessation of these ecclesiastical foundations and charities has been feelingly described by its historian, Sir William Dugdale;<sup>9</sup> but Hales and his friends were rich. This wealthy bureaucracy was to supply such political leaders as Lord Richard Rich, Chancellor Thomas Wriothesley, Sir Richard Morysine, Sir Ralph Sadleyr, Sir Anthony Dennis, and Sir Anthony Browne.<sup>10</sup>

In return for the patent on St. John's Hospital, Hales had been forced by the King to promise to erect a school. He did this in the grand style but at the same time refused to endow the new Free School of Coventry.<sup>11</sup> The city corporation brought suit against him, but Hales won the suit by a nice piece of legal chicanery. The school was endowed only in its founder's will.<sup>12</sup> Strangely enough, Hales had a real interest in education, was, as we shall see, a close friend

6 Preliminary operations with Ralph Sadleyr recorded in *Henry VIII Papers*, XIII, Part II, 279, no. 731; sale described by Sir William Dugdale, *Antiquities of Coventre* (Coventry, 1765), 46.

7 *Henry VIII Papers*, XIII, Part II, 100, no. 750; and Dugdale, *Antiquities*, 31.

8 Benjamin Poole, *Coventry, its History and Antiquities* (London, 1870), 423; *Henry VIII Papers*, XX, Part I, 666, no. 1335, ¶ 39; Dugdale, 39.

9 "For to so low an Ebbe did their trading soon after grow, for want of such Concourse of People that numerously resorted thither before that fatal Dissolution, that many thousands of the Inhabitants . . . were constrained to forsake the city;" Dugdale, *Antiquities*, 17.

10 Men of "vile birth," as the Earl of Surrey remarked, they were subservient to the Crown, see Kenneth Pickthorn, *Early Tudor Government, Henry VIII* (Cambridge, 1934), 530.

11 Dugdale, *Antiquities*, 38-39. He describes the property and gives the dedicatory inscription.

12 Hales's grant for St. John's was not dependent on his grant for the founding of the school, *Henry VIII Papers*, XX, Part I, 666, no. 1335, ¶ 38; so that the Coventry Corporation could break the latter patent, if they wished, but not the former. Poole, *Coventry*, 245-249, describes the lawsuit, and is supported by *The Itinerary of John Leland*, 1535-1543 ca., ed. by Lucy T. Smith, (2 vols., London, 1908), II, 107.

of the great educators, Ascham and Sturm, and published three books on the subject.<sup>13</sup>

In 1545, Hales became holder of a joint patent with Sadleyr for the office of the Clerk of the Hanaper of Chancery, and in this office he supervised all of the transfers of monastic and other lands that had fallen into the King's hands.<sup>14</sup> With all of this legal experience, wealth, and friends, he entered into the politics of Protector Somerset's regime in a distinctly advantageous position.

Along with the wave of religious reform at the opening of the reign of the boy-king, Edward VI, went a strong current of political and economic reform. Hales became a member of the reforming group called Commonwealth Men<sup>15</sup> and known for their great religious zeal and their determination to prevent the exploitation of the goods of the entire community

13 He brought out Plutarch's *Introductiones ad Grammaticam*, his own *Highway to Nobility*, and the *Preceptes of the Excellent Clerke and grave Philosopher Plutarche, for the Preservation of Good Health*. Listed in Robert Watt, *Bibliotheca Britannica* (4 vols.; Edinburgh, 1824), I, under John Hayles. These books are not obtainable in America.

14 The grant reads: "Sir Ralph Sadleyr, master or knight of the Great Wardrobe and John Hales of Coventry. Grant of the office of Keeper or Clerk of the Hanaper of Chancery, with fees and allowances specified . . . Oct. 25, 1545." *Henry VIII Papers*, XX, 328, no. 707, ¶ 48. I have quoted the important parts of this document because a very learned footnote of I. S. Leadam in "The English Refugees in Germany," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (N.S.; London, 1897), XI, 116-118, brings to light several facts which argue that John Hales of Coventry was not the same John Hales who was Clerk of the First Fruits, Clerk of the Hanaper, friend of Somerset, and leader in the Marian Exile. In spite of the fact that Hales is listed with all of these titles in *Calendar of Patent Rolls, Philip and Mary* (5 vols.; London, 1937-1939), I, 434, Leadam believes that there were two John Haleses, because during the Marian Exile, a John Hales still retained the Hanaper office. What happened was that Hales, on Feb. 20, 1554, quit-claimed the office to Sadleyr, but the reports still came in, as Leadam shows, as though from Sadleyr and Hales. This is easy to explain. Formally, they still held the patent, and so documents would be made out in both their names, even though Sadleyr alone was in England supervising the work. *Dictionary of National Biography*, XVII, 598 and *Patent Rolls Philip and Mary*, IV, 191. The patent was re-issued in 1557 to Sadleyr and one Francis Kempe; in this way Hales was able to fade out of the picture temporarily because the increasing vigor of the Marian government finally endangered his position. On his return to England, Hales was able to regain his office, not in 1559, as in John Strype, *Annals of the Reformation* (2 vols.; Oxford, 1824), I, Part I, 74, but in 1564. He brought suit against Kempe, and the report of the case was made to the Queen on Feb. 17, 1564. The decision apparently went in Hales's favor because his and Sadleyr's patent of 1545 gave way to a new one for Sir Richard Sadleyr and his son in 1572, when Kempe is not mentioned. See *Acts of the Privy Council*, (London, 1893), VII, 196. In order to enforce his case, Leadam interprets the duties of the Hanaper office too literally. Both Cromwell and Sadleyr held the office alone, at the same time that they held other more important posts, so that the actual duties involved must have been largely clerical and formal.

15 Frederic W. Russell, *Ket's Rebellion in Norfolk* (London, 1859), 202.

by a few individuals. With Somerset, Secretary Thomas Smith, Bishop Latimer, and the pamphleteer Robert Crowley, Hales tried to stop the expulsion of small landowners by the rising middle class. He has been called the "only statesman which the agrarian problem produced,"<sup>16</sup> and his work on the commission for the examination of enclosures in 1548, his presentation of three bills to the Commons in 1549, and his defense of his actions after agrarian rebellion had driven Somerset from power have been well described elsewhere.<sup>17</sup> The attempt to defend the manorial economy of the Middle Ages was rendered futile by the brutally extortionate government of the Duke of Northumberland, and Hales was forced into exile in 1550.<sup>18</sup>

After playing this brief but important rôle on the stage of national politics, Hales retired into obscurity, and it was perhaps at this time that he wrote his *Discourse of the Common Weale of this Realme of England*.<sup>19</sup> This little book, published in 1581, is such a penetrating discussion of the economic state of England that Hales has been called the only one to describe the national prosperity.<sup>20</sup> His understanding of money and inflation equals that of Bodin,<sup>21</sup> his conception of the balance of trade has a close similarity to that of later mercantilists<sup>22</sup> and his cure for the evils of enclosure seems almost scientific.

During Hales's first three years of exile, his activities were largely diplomatic and secular, as they had been in Eng-

16 R. H. Tawney, *The Agrarian Problem in the Sixteenth Century* (London, 1912), 6. The Commonwealth Men are also described, and Latimer is named their "prophet," Hales, their "man of action," p. 403.

17 John Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials* (4 vols.; Oxford, 1822), III, 147-150, 210, 260-268, and IV, 351-365; James A. Froude, *History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth*, (12 vols.; New York, 1890), VI, 150-180; Albert F. Pollard, *The History of England from the Accession of Edward VI to the Death of Elizabeth*, vol. VI of *The Political History of England*, ed. by William Hunt and Reginald L. Poole, (12 vols.; London, 1905-1910), 35-40. A useful collection of documents is to be found in Patrick F. Tytler, *England under the Reigns of Edward VI and Mary* (2 vols.; London, 1839).

18 Tawney, *The Agrarian Problem*, 372. Northumberland's policy "was exactly what it seemed to be, a straightforward attempt to prevent the poor from protesting when their possessions were taken from them by the rich." Hales may have been in prison, see John Strype, *Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer* (Oxford, 1812), 442.

19 Edited by Elizabeth Lamond, (Cambridge, 1893). See also Elizabeth Lamond, "The Date and Authorship of the Examination of Complaints," *English Historical Review*, VI (April, 1893), 284-305.

20 W. J. Cunningham, *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce* (5th ed.; 3 vols.; Cambridge, 1915), I, 552.

21 Andre Tersen, *John Hales, sa doctrine et son temps* (Avallon, 1907), 71.

22 Br. Suvarantra, *The Theory of the Balance of Trade in England* (Helsinki, 1923), 34 ff, 61-66, and 88.

land; but after 1553, he became more closely associated with the religious refugees of the reign of Mary and went home in 1558 a convinced and ardent Calvinist. He is especially difficult to follow during this period, as he travelled much and was apparently involved in secret diplomatic and religious negotiations.

The exile was well received by the leading Continental reformers, because both he and his brother, Christopher, had many contacts. The latter had left England to study in 1543 and had joined the group of reformers at Strassburg.<sup>23</sup> He was noticed here in 1548 by Sir Thomas Hoby.<sup>24</sup> The London merchants, John Abell and Richard Hilles, and such prominent English students and reformers as Richard Sadleyr (brother of Ralph) and John Burcher were also there, studying under Bucer, Fagius, Sturm, and Martyr. The English colony has been considered<sup>25</sup> the link which made easy both the migration of the Strassburg reformers to England and the subsequent reception of the English reformers in Strassburg. In any case, Christopher Hales's connections with them all and with the Zurichers, Bullinger and Gualter, whom he visited and for whom he performed certain services,<sup>26</sup> were passed on by letters to John.

However, it was not only through Christopher that John had connections, for he had been in 1548 the recipient of a letter from Bucer. The latter described his difficulties and Cranmer invited him to England on the basis of this letter.<sup>27</sup>

23 Christopher Hales had left St. Johns College, Cambridge, where he had come in contact with the Cambridge humanist group; Christina Hallowell Garrett, *The Marian Exiles* (Cambridge, 1938), 171.

24 *The Travels and Life of Sir Thomas Hoby . . . written by himself, 1547-1564*, edited by Edgar Powell, (London, 1902), 4-6.

25 By Miss Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, 48-50. Richard Hillies's invitation from Strassburg to the other English exiles is described in Richard W. Dixon, *History of the Church of England* (London, 1891), IV, 686.

26 Christopher appears very frequently in the letters of Burcher to Bullinger. Various English churches wished paintings of the Zurich reformers and Hales was commissioned to get them. It is only by this correspondence that we can try to follow the movements of John in 1550. *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation*, ed. by Hastings Robinson, (2 vols.; Cambridge, 1846), II, 184-196, 660-661. In one of these letters, Christopher calls John the elder brother; Burke and Berry, *loc. cit.*, are apparently wrong in naming Christopher, the elder. Christopher was apparently a retiring man and supported his brother in public activity; Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, 171, Leadam, "The English Refugees," 120.

27 Thomas Cranmer to Martin Bucer, Oct. 2, 1548; "I have read your letter to John Hales in which you relate the miserable condition of Germany . . . to you, therefore, my Bucer, our kingdom will be a most safe harbor." *Original Letters*, I, 19-20.

In addition, Hales's activities at the imperial court from 1550-1552 brought him into contact with Cranmer's confidential agent, Dr. Christopher Mount. Perhaps he took part in Cranmer's effort to get Continental reformers to come to England.<sup>28</sup>

Hales was used by Secretary of State Cecil as a sort of field man in Germany. He worked in conjunction with the English ambassadors and with the leaders of the Reformed religion. And so we find him in the summer of 1550 in Augsburg<sup>29</sup> with Sir Philip Hoby<sup>30</sup> and Dr. Mount.<sup>31</sup> These diplomats were in attendance on the Emperor, who had convened the Diet there on July 10. What Hales did at this time is not recorded at all and whether he took a planned trip to Zurich to see Bullinger is not known. It is, however, not too bold to presume that he made the acquaintance of the Bernese and Zurich reformers through his brother and through Mount.<sup>32</sup>

Sir Richard Morysine replaced Hoby on Nov. 11, 1550;<sup>33</sup> and Ascham, Hales, and Mount worked under Morysine for the next two years. Much later Mount wrote his reminiscences of this time to Ascham: "Often I am accustomed to retell to myself in my memory that most happy sojourn and company, which we passed under the wings of Sir Morison at that time oratour of most holly King Edward VI with Charles V."<sup>34</sup>

28 Mount's work in Henry VIII's unitive attempt of 1538-1539 and his efforts in the second conciliar plan of Cranmer have been shown in John T. McNeill, *Unitive Protestantism* (New York, 1930), 171-173, 238-243.

29 He may have arrived on the continent in February and was certainly there in June. Christopher Hales wrote Gualter on May 24 that John might come to Zurich, and to Bullinger on June 12, he is much more specific: "I think that my elder brother, John Hales, who was the cause of my quick and sudden departure from you, will come over to you this summer from Augsburg." There is a hint here that John in person may have caused his brother's departure; and if this is so, he was on the continent in February, because Christopher was in London by March 4. Miss Lamond apparently did not see the letter of June 12 and so concludes: "His precise movements were not known to his brother, Christopher." *Discourse*, xxvi.

30 Hoby, *Travels*, 62, Augsburg, Aug. 5, 1550: "Here I found my brother attending for Sir Richard Morisine's cumming, who was appointed by the King and Counsell to succeed him."

31 Burcher to Bullinger, Dec. 28, 1550: "Mr. Christopher Mount has been for these last six mo. at Augsburg." *Original Letters*, II, 675.

32 Mount was known at both towns. Burcher to Bullinger, Sept. 1, 1550: "I have sent your letter to Dr. Mont at Augsburg; for he is there with the English ambassadors." *Ibid.*, 671. Also, Provost and Council of Berne to King Edward VI, Dec. 14, 1549: "Your ambassador, Master Christopher Mount, has delivered the invitation for a council . . ." *Ibid.*, 717.

33 Hoby, *Travels*, 63: "When Mr. Morisine was arrived we sett owt of Augspurg the xith of Nov."

34 Strassburg, Dec. 24, 1565. Roger Ascham, *The Whole Works of Roger Ascham*, ed. by Dr. Giles, (3 vols.; London, 1865), III, 123.



Hales had gone to Antwerp to meet Morysine and Ascham in October.<sup>35</sup> Ascham's letters of this period show his friendships, many of which he held in common with Hales. He had been in long consultation before leaving England with Sir John Cheke, tutor of the King and outstanding Greek scholar at Cambridge.<sup>36</sup> He wished to be remembered to such Cambridge fellow teachers and humanistic reformers as Pilkington, Lever, and Wilson; and he was bringing Lady Morysine to meet her husband.<sup>37</sup> Hales may have accompanied the group to Augsburg, for the next mention of him is found in a letter of Morysine to Cecil of Jan. 7, 1551.<sup>38</sup> This shows that Hales was being used by the Secretary of State to check up on the Ambassador and keep him active, for Morysine wrote: "Master Hales plieth me with precepts and breeds a desire in me to please you both."

Soon after this report, Hales made a trip to England in order to transact private business and probably to give Cecil his impressions of Morysine. These were not all favorable to the Ambassador, because the latter answered the various criticisms on Mar. 23, 1551. Among other things, he wrote that "Mr. Hales says that I am too merry."<sup>39</sup> This may have been quite literally true, for Morysine had three illegitimate children.<sup>40</sup> Morysine's reports over the winter were meagre and almost all filled with private business that he wanted Hales and others to do for him,<sup>41</sup> and his lax conduct and apparently

35 Antwerp, Oct. 1, 1550, Ascham to Edward Raven: "Tonight, that humanistic and wise man John Hales greeted us most suitably." Ascham, *Works*, II, 210. Most of Ascham's letters are in Latin; the translations are mine.

36 Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, III, 122.

37 Ascham, *Works*, II, 211-212. This Cambridge humanist group consisted of the nation's leaders in educational, political, and religious life and was closely associated with the Commonwealth Men. I have been greatly aided in my study of it by the Rev. Dr. Winthrop Hudson, who has recently presented a doctoral dissertation, *John Ponet* (Chicago, 1940), where a thorough treatment of it can be found.

38 *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, Edward VI*, ed. by William B. Turnbull, (London: 1861), 66-68. A dispatch immediately following this one describes what Morysine wanted Hales to do for him in London. He wanted to sell some of his western lands because he was lacking in funds and at the same time urged Cecil to get Hales to sell more of his own land and stop pestering him for an allowance. On the basis of this and a letter of Ascham's *Works*, I, lxiv, where Hales is referred to as a "most convenient letter carrier," Miss Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, 123, concludes that Hales made several trips to England and acted as a regular messenger. The available evidence seems to point to this trip and perhaps one more.

39 *Foreign Papers, Ed. VI*, 80.

40 Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, 99.

41 He used Cecil also, *Foreign Papers, Ed. VI*, 66-97, *passim*.

undiplomatic language<sup>42</sup> led to his replacement by the former Ambassador, Dr. Wotton.<sup>43</sup>

Hales rejoined him by April 27, after having made a trip through the Rhineland. He wrote a report<sup>44</sup> to Cecil on the agricultural conditions in the country comparing techniques and standards with the English ones. Enclosed in this dispatch came Morysine's best defense of his actions. He was angry at Hales and probably attributed his losing the post to his assistant's report. He "will not regard John Hales's complaints," but will gladly receive criticism directly from the Council.

Miss Garrett's picture of the enmity between Morysine and Hales is exaggerated. Certainly the ambassador's language is harsh on several occasions, but his reports seem to me to show an impulsive, charming, and volatile nature. After this anger against Hales and the Council, he wrote reports that look like tomes in order to get back into favor,<sup>45</sup> and when Dr. Wotton arrived in June, 1551, he was able to regain his post from the older man, because he was "liked by the Emperor."<sup>46</sup> The humanist Ambassador must soon have patched up matters with Hales, who was, after all, his brother-in-law,<sup>47</sup> for their relations continued to be most cordial.

By November, 1551, the English Ambassador and Ascham followed the Emperor to Innsbruck,<sup>48</sup> and Hales seems to have left the court. That the two remained on the best of terms is shown by Hales's being named executor in Morysine's will at the time of the latter's death at Strassburg in 1555.<sup>49</sup>

42 Morysine defended himself in a letter to the whole Council when he heard of his replacement. He says he can't help giving his opinions and that he won't learn French, as he was directed, in order that he might speak with the French Ambassador. Then he asks Cecil to stand by him. *Ibid.*, April 28, 1551, 97.

43 Wotton was also put in because he was less staunchly Protestant. *Ibid.*, April 6, 84.

44 *Ibid.*, 95-96. Miss Garrett says that he was sent to investigate agriculture and watch Morysine. *The Marian Exiles*, 172.

45 *Foreign Papers*, Ed. VI, 86-88 and 196-214, *passim*.

46 *Ibid.*, 162.

47 This was Stephen, "who married the sister of Morysin." Ascham to Raven, London, Sept. 17, 1550, *Works*, II, 208. Morysine had quite a reputation as a humanist. He translated some of the works of Sturm and of Vives. He defended the Henrician reforms against Coclaeus in 1537 and was sent to support Peter Martyr in the 1549 disputation at Oxford, Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, 99.

48 *Foreign Papers*, Ed. VI, 196.

49 "John Hales, a noted scholar of that time, (to whom Morysine gave his works) was one of his executors, as having always been an entire friend to him." Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, 100.

Other friends of Morysine's were leaders of the humanist and Protestant circles in the Alsatian city, such as Bernardino Ochino, John Ponet, and Sir Thomas Hoby.<sup>50</sup>

Hales had been attracted to these diplomats because they all had in common humanistic interests and Protestant beliefs. The strength of his friendship for Ascham is shown by the latter's letter introducing him to John Sturm, the Strassburg reformer, humanist, and teacher.<sup>51</sup> Ascham says: "John Hales, a man as intelligent as he is most frank and sincere, will deliver this letter to Strassburg . . . Do not doubt what sort of man he is as is shown by the frequent talk of our Mount . . . Hales can tell you the news better than long writings."

This letter led to the exile's staying with Sturm till the middle of the next summer. He may have helped to put out Sturm's edition of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, for he sent Ascham the first volume in November<sup>52</sup> and the second in February.<sup>53</sup> But Hales's activity was not only literary, for Cranmer still seemed to consider him an official of the English King. The Archbishop wrote to Bucer's widow on April 20, 1552, that Hales as a royal treasurer had been commanded by the Council to give her £100. He enclosed the order so that she could make arrangements with Hales, "who is now, I think, at Strassburg."<sup>54</sup>

When he left the city is difficult to discover. His whereabouts were not known to Morysine in November, 1552,<sup>55</sup> so that theory that these men worked very closely under Cecil is

50 *Ibid.*, Hales's continued support is shown by his letter to Cecil of Mar. 23, 1557, when he asks aid for Lady Morysine and her son, "who lieth under the surgeon's fingers." *Historical Manuscripts Commission*, "Calendar of the Manuscripts of . . . the Marquis of Salisbury," (London, 1883), I, 140, no. 520.

51 Augsburg, Sept. 27, 1551, Ascham, *Works*, II, 303.

52 Ascham to E. Raven and W. Ireland (Cambridge teachers), Nov. 17, 1551. *Ibid.*, 315.

53 Ascham to Sturm, Halle (with Morysine), Jan. 29, 1552. *Ibid.*, I, lxxvii: "Perhaps you have heard from Hales." Sturm's answer came, written Jan. 30, 1552. *Ibid.*, II, 324: "Hales and I will shortly send you the second book of the *Rhetoric*."

54 *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer*, ed. by John E. Cox, (Cambridge, 1846), 435.

55 *Foreign Papers, Ed. VI*, Morysine to Cecil, Speyer, Nov. 9, 1552, 226: "Cannot send Cecil's letter to Mr. Hales, because he wots not where he is. Hales and Mr. Throgmorton went together from Spire and since then he has heard neither of the one nor of the other." (I have been unable to identify this Throgmorton. Two are mentioned in *Ibid.*, 110 and 123, but neither seem to be related to this one.)

exaggerated.<sup>56</sup> It may be that Hales was at this time engaged in secret negotiations with various German reformers in order to forward Cranmer's second conciliar attempt, but the secrecy made necessary by the ecclesiastical censor has made the evidence slight and ambiguous.<sup>57</sup>

The last mention of Hales in this period was in a letter of Ascham's of July 7, 1553, about the time of the death of Edward VI.<sup>58</sup> Hales and Mount were apparently with the two English emissaries at the imperial court in Brussels.

Between this letter and Hales's appearance in Frankfort in 1555, that is for the first two years of the Marian exile, he sinks into obscurity. He may have gone to England in great secrecy,<sup>59</sup> but he probably did not return again to Strassburg.<sup>60</sup>

The importance of this confused period in Hales's life, on which so little material exists, lies in the political contacts which he made and in his increasing reputation in European humanistic circles. The men who went to Strassburg when the conservative terror under Mary began were largely connected with him and were important in the formation of the Elizabeth church and state. Strassburg has been called "the center of political sedition."<sup>61</sup> From it came the revolutionary

56 They certainly were all of the same group but not enough information exists to support the theory of Miss Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, 14-16. Cecil's interest seems to have been merely to gather information.

57 McNeill, *Unitive Protestantism*, 242-251. A letter from John Aurifaber, "the Duke of Saxony's preacher," to Hales was forwarded to Cecil by Morysine on Feb. 20, 1553. Both the ambassadorial report and the preacher's letter are so full of obscurities for the benefit of the censor that they make little sense. Morysine doesn't know of the matter but wants Cecil's opinion. Such cryptic sentences occur: "Love must be borne though party is not seen." Aurifaber's letter, from Weimar, Dec. 26, 1552, tells of several interceptions of his letters, speaks of how "the affair must be hastened," refers to "Count Albert, who waits for Hale's coming," and says that Hales must have been aware of the situation "by letters to Philip [Melanethon]." *Foreign Papers*, Ed. VI, 248-249.

58 To Cheke, *Works*, II, 366: "And so I refer you to the judgment of two of the finest men, Christopher Mount and John Hales, who receive the greatest praise for their doctrine; but they get from Sturm, a far greater tribute to their humanism, prudence, experience, good counsel, judgment, and religion."

59 Ascham to Sir Thomas Radcliffe (then in England, later Earl of Sussex and Protestant peer under Elizabeth; Pollard, *History of England*, 207 and n.2), *Works*, II, 409-410. He asks to be remembered to "my dearest brother, John H., one of your group." However, this evidence is weakened by the fact that although the letter is thought to be of March, 1554, it is undated.

60 Most English refugees are listed and his name does not appear. Lamond, "The Date and Authorship," xxvi, tells of one Professor Saspworth's search for materials on Hales in the Zürich and Strassburg unpublished archives. It was fruitless.

61 Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, 27-29.

writings of Ponet, Becon, and Sampson; and in it were such educational leaders as Cheke, Haddon, Anthony Cooke, and Thomas Wrothe.<sup>62</sup>

Hales's residence in Frankfort is first recorded by Sir Thomas Hoby, who passed through the town with his brother Philip in September, 1555. Ashley, Cope, Sutton, the pastor Whitehead, Bale, and Turner are also mentioned as leaders and the size of the colony is estimated at one hundred.<sup>63</sup>

The group which had sprung up in the Rhenish city after the summer of 1553 had been made up of Puritans, who wished to follow the simple Reformed services established in London by the Polish pastor, John à Lasco, and who preferred the service of Calvin and Knox to that of the second Edwardian Prayer Book.<sup>64</sup> Hales may have been present when in the summer of 1555 the Anglican party forced the original group, led by Knox, William Whittingham, and Christopher Goodman, to conform to the English traditions; but the struggle had subsided by September.<sup>65</sup>

This conflict is one of great importance because here are most clearly distinguished the Anglican and the Puritan parties. Grindal, Jewel, Cox, Thomas Lever, Whitehead, Horne, Becon, Sandys, Bale, and Sampson all came to the aid of the Anglican minority in Frankfort and prevented the more fundamental changes desired by the Puritans. Many of these men became Elizabethan bishops and were also either of the Strassburg or of the Zürich group.<sup>66</sup> Their successful repression of the Calvinists was a "direct progenitor of the Puritanical disturbances which later arose in England." It is significant that one of the good contemporary accounts of it was written as a

62 Dixon, *Church of England*, IV, 685-688.

63 Hoby, *Travels*, 123.

64 Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, 118-124.

65 William Whittingham (?), *A Brief Discourse of the Troubles Begun at Frankfort, 1554-1558*, ed. by Edward Arber, (London, 1908), 21-96.

66 Cf. their letter to John Calvin of April 5, 1555, justifying their cause; *Ibid.*, 78. "This letter is signed by two men who became archbishops, Grindal and Sandys; and by three bishops, Bale, Cox, and Horne; while Whitehead had refused the Archbishopric of Armaugh." Note, *Ibid.*, loc. cit. Jewel, who joined the group later, became Bishop of Salisbury, Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, 199. Lever was leader of the Wesel and Aran congregations, Becon, as we have seen, was a prominent propagandist at Strassburg; *Ibid.*, 84. Sampson could have obtained almost any Elizabethan advancement if he had conformed; *Ibid.*, 281. Further information on these men can be found in "Brief Discourse of the Troubles begun at Frankfort," *Edinburgh Review*, LXXXV, (Art. VI, April, 1847), 421.



piece of propaganda in the Puritan-Anglican debates of 1573 and 1576.<sup>67</sup>

The congregation shrank a good deal towards the end of 1555 because both the Strassburg visitors and many of the original Puritans left.<sup>68</sup> It has also been said that David Whitehead was an inefficient pastor.<sup>69</sup> He resigned in January, 1556; and Robert Horne, who had been in Zürich with the philanthropical merchant, Robert Chambers, came to take charge in March.<sup>70</sup> Horne made apparently quite a success of his ministry and the congregation grew during the rest of the year.<sup>71</sup>

An interesting sidelight on the composition of the group during this summer is given in the report of one John Brett, who had been sent out by Archbishop Heath of York to deliver "certain letters and commandments" to various English refugees.<sup>72</sup> Brett's mission shows the insecurity of the exiles' legal position, because he represented a monarch who could bring diplomatic pressure to bear on the German officials. Therefore, the Marian emissary was treated very roughly and most often kept from the officials whom the exiles feared and revered.<sup>73</sup>

Brett tried to present his letters at Frankfort to Mistress Jane Wilkinson, probably the wealthiest person in the congregation, but he was turned away with soft words. He next

67 Whittingham, *A Brief Discourse*, 21-22. The supposed author describes briefly his purpose and the state of the debate of 1573. John Knox, who was involved in the Frankfort struggle as much as Whittingham, also wrote a history of it: "A Brief discourse of the troubles begonne at Frankford in Germany, A.D. 1554 . . ." in *Works*, ed. by David Laing, (6 vols.; Edinburgh, 1895), IV, 9-68.

68 Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, 130-133.

69 Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, 236.

70 Whittingham, *A Brief Discourse*, 95-96.

71 Horne later became Bishop of Winchester; Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, 154. He was apparently a vigorous and honest Protestant. After having been made Dean of Durham in 1551, he joined Knox in attacking the mass and in simplifying ecclesiastical practices in spite of his bishop's desires; Charles Sturge, *Cuthbert Tunstall* (London, 1938), 284, 300-301. His manliness is shown by his having refused to take the bishopric of Durham over Tunstall's head, as the Duke of Northumberland desired. The Duke wished to take action against him for this stand; Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, IV, 22. Sturge suggests that the Dean was protected by certain persons at Court, perhaps even by the King. Sturge, *Tunstall*, 284.

72 Edited by I. S. Leadam "the English Refugees."

73 Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, 18. He was chased away from the castle of Windheim by the retainers of the Duchess of Suffolk; Leadam, "the English Refugees," 122-128. Then he was practically imprisoned by the English at Heidelberg, and some tried to bribe him. Sir Anthony Cooke and a Frenchman tried to have him waylaid near Strassburg, and finally, Becon threatened him at Speyer; *Ibid.*, 129-131.

went to Hales, who refused point-blank to receive the letters. An angry scene followed in which threats were freely exchanged. According to Brett, Hales said: "The Quenes Maiesty had no power to sende proces into those parties nor I to present them, as I sholde well preceyve to my paynes or my departure thence."<sup>74</sup> But before he left, Brett gave the summonses to Sutton and Wood, two of the earliest members of the congregation. These men and Christopher Hales probably all lived together,<sup>75</sup> and as a group they immediately went to the "Consull," whom they apparently did not fear.

John presented a fierce argument, saying that the liberties of Frankfort had been encroached upon by Brett and Queen Mary, that the summonses should be taken back, and that Brett should be jailed. The Burgomaster agreed, but Brett begged off the next day on the grounds that he and his victims were all Englishmen and thus not under the Frankfort jurisdiction.<sup>76</sup> Whether he was successful in issuing the summonses or whether he merely succeeded in keeping out of jail is not told.

In the middle of January, 1557, another disturbance broke out in the troubled church at Frankfort. Refugee tempers were short, because of the crowded conditions of living, lack of usual occupation, and even, perhaps, the weather.<sup>77</sup> One Thomas Ashley, who lived with Hales, had a quarrel with the Pastor Horne; and although it was patched up, the minister and elders took action against him for insulting their dignity.<sup>78</sup>

The conflict which grew out of this offhand tiff has almost universally been judged a mere exhibition of bad temper. Dixon writes of it: "It is not necessary to go through the miserable minutes of the quarrel; to recount the fetches, checks, cavillations, insinuations, defamations on one side or the other."<sup>79</sup> But both he and Knappen agree that as an experiment in Congregationalism, the affair is important, even if it is sordid.<sup>80</sup> As these writers say, maladministration, jealousy, and selfishness play a large rôle and seem to show that the

74 *Ibid.*, 119-120; Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, 334.

75 Leadam, "The English Refugees," 120.

76 *Ibid.*, 121.

77 Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, 21; Whittingham, *A Brief Discourse*, 99.

78 Leadam, "The English Refugees," 120.

79 *Church of England*, IV, 698. He also quotes a letter of the martyrologist, Fox, to Peter Martyr, *Ibid.*, 699, in which Fox shows disgust with the struggle.

80 Knappen devotes a chapter to it, *Tudor Puritanism*, 149-160, but dismisses the subject with the judgment that the men were "indigent emigres squabbling over the division of relief funds."

antagonists were thinking only of the immediate questions involved; but there is evidence to believe that at least some of the men were at the same time consciously working out a politico-religious experiment. The conditions of their life would seem to support this theory; for the exiles were separated from their national state, their bishops had no official backing, their number was so small that even servants voted,<sup>81</sup> their isolation and inactivity led to a break-down of social barriers, and finally their opinions became more radical as time went on.<sup>82</sup> This is not to say that we are dealing here with high-minded political theorists, but the exiles' nastiness is not pointless. It is the sort of nastiness which made Sir Edward Coke such an important Puritan statesman in the Parliament of 1621.<sup>83</sup>

The original Ashley-Horne quarrel was so obviously a pretext that the subject of it is not mentioned. Instead, it immediately grew into a question of political principles in which Ashley and Hales used several parliamentary tricks. When called before the elders, Ashley's argument was that since the case was between him and the elders, it could be judged only by "the whole Church and Ecclesiastical Discipline." Horne and the elders answered with the usual claim to prerogative: "They had received their authority from the whole Church and would retain and keep the same."<sup>84</sup> This claim was not only Anglican but also Puritan, and the attack upon it could find immediate precedent only in the egalitarian and democratic ideas of the Anabaptists.<sup>85</sup>

Hales, who had been absent at the beginning, wrote a letter calling a meeting of the congregation. He desired peace

81 This is a great change from Cox's ruling of the previous year that only ordained ministers could vote; Whittingham, *A Brief Discourse*, 72.

82 Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, 19-22.

83 Coke's brand of intimidation, his violent and often hypocritical defense of principles, and his great ability at parliamentary technique, appear in his speeches. His use of the test case technique, such as this Ashley-Horne quarrel, is very important, and the careful twist with which he turned a discussion of war subsidy into a discussion of royal prerogative is a marvel of legalistic subtlety. Not only are many of these processes outlined in the Frankfort struggle, but also similar democratic principles are involved. For a good description of Coke's activity in the Parliament of 1621, see Samuel R. Gardiner, *History of England, 1603-1640* (10 vols.; London, 1884-1891), IV, 40-55, 232-268.

84 Whittingham, *A Brief Discourse*, 99-100.

85 Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, 149. A brief description of autoeratic Calvinistic discipline can be found in R. N. Carew-Hunt, *John Calvin* (London, 1933), 141-151; or in A. Mitchell Hunter, *The Teaching of Calvin* (Glasgow, 1920), 195-224.

and concord, but only, as it developed, on his own conditions. The whole congregation was to try the case, but Horne read a decree he had from the city magistrate, which counselled them not to cause trouble. Horne deduced that the document meant that he should rule and called Hales and those at the meeting schismatical. Hales, on the other hand, deduced that the affair should be carried on outside of the legal machinery of the city and attacked Horne for jeopardizing the congregation's position by his pestering the magistrate.<sup>86</sup> A few days later Hales won a preliminary victory, for Horne and his assistant, Chambers, were foolish enough to permit the congregation "without their favor and good will" to decide perfectly freely whether the ministers had absolute rule in this case or were merely adversaries of Ashley.<sup>87</sup> Here they admitted that the Hales group was not schismatical and tacitly handed over the rights of sovereignty to the congregation. This transfer is exactly the same sort of operation which Coke later brought to pass when he achieved for Parliament the prerogative of trying Lord Chancellor Bacon.<sup>88</sup>

Seeing his advantage, Hales made a grand gesture at the meeting: "My brethren, seeing I am accused of the Pastor before the whole Church, as the author of Schism; . . . if you also judge of me in like sort, I will depart out of this Company, as being one unmeet to tarry with you in the Assembly."<sup>89</sup> The trick worked and Hales was called back.

Apparently following the other's tactics, Horne and Deacon Chambers tried to resign. They not only consented to come back, but were also immediately subjected to questions. They refused to answer on the grounds that questions could be asked only by official representatives.<sup>90</sup> It was up to Hales and his faction to object to this idea and to present such important questions that they could get full support from the community. Here they struck upon the plan of attacking the financial arrangements of Chambers.<sup>91</sup> According to them,

<sup>86</sup> Whittingham, *A Brief Discourse*, 101-103.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, 105.

<sup>88</sup> Coke was not especially interested in prosecuting Bacon, but he was interested in preventing the King from doing it and in establishing the right of Parliament to try the highest royal official; Gardiner, *History of England*, 65-74.

<sup>89</sup> Whittingham, *A Brief Discourse*, 105.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, 108.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, 118-119.

he was being inefficient in handing out funds and thus much hardship was caused. He alone knew the accounts of the group, and even if he were honest, he might die and leave anything in disorder. That these complaints were justified is probably not true, for Chambers had a reputation for philanthropy<sup>92</sup> and the congregation is known to have been well-off financially.<sup>93</sup> It was, however, a most convenient tool to use against the pastor; and as the questions became more important, the right to ask them was taken for granted.

The congregation appointed eight men to amend the discipline and to record the doings of the day. Horne tried to control this committee and enforce his superiority by merely claiming to be the true minister. Few followed him, however, and after many comings and goings, appeals to the magistrate and to the other pastors of the town, the conservatives left the congregation.<sup>94</sup> Even a deputation from Strassburg, consisting of the two gentlemen, Thomas Wrote and Francis Knollys and of the important cleric, Edwin Sandys, could not help out the defeated pastor.<sup>95</sup>

The final decision for the government of the church made it Congregational:

The Pastors, Elders, and Deacons were put from their ecclesiastical functions, by an Edict signed and subscribed with three of the magistrates' hands; and were all made private men, as the rest of the Congregation. And, by the same Edict of the Magistrates, it was decreed that the Congregation might freely, when they would, choose either them or other Ministers . . . Moreover, order was taken, by the same Edict . . . that the Deacons should at certain appointed times, give us an Account of it [their office], before the Ministers of the Word and Seniors. We were licensed by the same Edict . . . to draw out an Ecclesiastical Discipline; whereby the Congregation should be governed.<sup>96</sup>

The decision that the church was greater than the pastor had been won, and it is significant that the interest of the radical group was (unlike that of Browne and the later Congregationalists)<sup>97</sup> purely political. The second Edwardian Prayer

92 Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, 111-114.

93 *Ibid.*, 19. She uses very frequently R. Jung, *Englische Fluechtlings-Gemeinde*, which lists Church, Burger, Tax, and Dwelling Lists. Hales was assessed on a fortune of £850.

94 Whittingham, *A Brief Discourse*, 111, 118-122.

95 Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, 156, describes the congregation as believing in its complete political and ecclesiastical independence.

96 Whittingham, *A Brief Discourse*, 122-123.

97 Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, 157. He also has an interesting chapter on Browne, 303-316.



Book was retained in a political democracy run by parliamentary procedure. Ponet had already set forth democratic principles, and the influence of his *Treatise of Politike Power* must have been felt in Frankfort.<sup>98</sup> Both Ponet's work and Whittingham's *Troubles Begun at Frankfort* were republished on the eve of the Civil War, so that Miss Garrett's admirable summary of the movement rings true:

As a political party the group returned to England in 1558 . . . allied for party ends with a body of Protestant ministers; experienced in self-government untrammelled of bishops; trained in effective methods of propaganda; and actuated by a political philosophy that looked askance at the prerogative of kings. In 1559 these country gentlemen organized a secret cabal in Elizabeth's first House of Commons to fight the passage of the Supremacy Bill. In 1643 their descendants, in spirit and in the flesh, openly opposed the Crown in the Long Parliament, using as campaign documents the political pamphlets of the Marian Exile. *The Troubles Begun at Frankfort* were to close in civil war.<sup>99</sup>

Hales was one of the moving forces of this group. In 1559 he returned to England and presented the *Oration of John Hales to Queen Elizabeth . . . at Her First Entrance to Her Reign*.<sup>100</sup> From its references to the "tyranny of Malicious Mary" and to "Vertuous Elizabeth," one might conclude that it was a violently loyal tract; but the writer's support is dependent on the Queen's fulfilling of a definite Puritan program, taken largely from Ponet's *Politike Power*.<sup>101</sup> He loyally exhorts with such force that he seems to command. From this tract, Hales might be classed with the political and religious radicals, such as Coverdale, Humphrey, Lever, Knox, and Foxe, but his personal connections with the more moderate English reformers and with the heads of the administration and his apparent lack of interest in ecclesiastical forms would rather place him on the left wing of the Anglican group.<sup>102</sup>

After the establishment of the Elizabethan church, one

98 Cf. the work of Mr. Hudson, referred to above, n. 37.

99 Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, 59.

100 The rest of the title is: *Being a Parallel to these TIMES* (1688). This refers to the accession of William of Orange when Hales's work was first printed.

101 Hudson, *John Ponet*. The program is set forth mainly on pp. 7-10.

102 Hales was in contact, as usual, with Cecil, now Lord Treasurer; cf. his letter to Cecil of Mar. 20, 1559, *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series*, III, (London, 1861), no. 27, 125. The Strassburg group of humanists were in a position of power because of Cecil and Ascham: Pollard, *History of England*, 183-187, and Hales's contacts with them remained very close; cf. Ascham's and Sturm's letters in *The Zurich Letters* (3 vols.; Cambridge, 1842), II, 64-69, 92-93 and in Ascham, *Works*, II, 93-96, 116-122, 162-167, 173.

of the greatest interests of the Puritan politicians was in the question of Elizabeth's marriage. No one could know that she would be a sturdy guide for forty-five years, and it seemed as though the fate of Protestantism in England rested on the frail life of a young woman.<sup>103</sup> Great efforts were made in the Parliament of 1562 to get the Queen to marry, and the failure of this drive led Hales to take part in a conspiracy. He wrote a pamphlet entitled *A Declaration of the Succession of the Crozen Imperiall of England*, in which he set up the claims to the throne of the Protestant house of Suffolk as opposed to those of the Catholic house of Stuart.<sup>104</sup> The Lord Keeper, Nicholas Bacon, Lord Grey of Pyrgo, the head of the Suffolk family, and perhaps even Cecil himself were implicated in the composition of this seditious book.<sup>105</sup>

On the publication of the *Declaration* in January, 1564, Hales was thrown in prison,<sup>106</sup> and an inquiry was made against him and his collaborator, Francis Newdigate. Cecil, Bacon, Hales, and Newdigate were so successful in covering their tracks that the punishment meted out was very light.<sup>107</sup> The Spanish Ambassador reported the Queen as saying that the action could not be pushed because there would be too many important accomplices to punish.<sup>108</sup>

Interest in the marriage question did not, of course, die with this incident. In the negotiations between Elizabeth and Mary Stuart in 1565 and 1569, Hales's pamphlet played a part,

103 Jewel to Peter Martyr, Feb. 7, 1562, *Zurich Letters*, II, 103: "O how wretched are we, who cannot tell under what sovereign we are to live." See also J. E. Neale, "Parliament and the Succession Question in 1562/3 and in 1566," *English Historical Review*, XXXVI, (Oct., 1921), 497.

104 The work was first published in 1563, but the only edition obtainable in America is that printed in the appendix of *The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England* (London, 1713), xx-xliii. Hales's discussion of hereditary right was legally so good that this author frequently quotes him in connection with his argument on the Hanoverian succession.

105 The extent of complicity can be determined by examining the minutes of the inquiry in Samuel Haynes, *A Collection of State Papers . . . Left by William Cecil Lord Burghley* (2 vols.; London, 1740), I, 412-418. See also *Calendar of State Papers, Spanish, Elizabeth* (London, 1892), I, 176, 179-180, 365, 424.

106 Strype, *Annals*, I, Part II, 118. The declaration against Hales and the presentment of the jury of Middlesex can be found in *Historical Manuscripts Commission*, "Salisbury Mss.," XIII, 66.

107 For Hales and Newdigate, Strype, *Annals*, I, Part II, 121, and *Spanish Papers*, I, 365. For Bacon, Haynes, *Ibid.*, 416-418, and Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, 176.

108 *Spanish Papers loc. cit.* Cecil's complicity is doubted by Neale, "Parliament and Succession," 500, but he shows how near he came to being involved in the inquiry by his letters to Smith of April and May, 1564, Ellis, *Original Letters*, 2nd ser. II, 285.

and in the early 1570's, both Walsingham and Sir Philip Sydney fought against the ambitions of the Catholic Duke of Norfolk and of the Duke of Alencon.<sup>109</sup>

As important as the court intrigues were the efforts of the House of Commons. In 1566, the desire for settling the succession was so violent that Elizabeth experienced great difficulty in getting subsidies, and Neale believes that the movement among Puritans did not stop until the fall of Peter Wentworth in 1592.<sup>110</sup> The question came up again in 1571 and 1572 because of the threat of the Duke of Norfolk and the related Ridolfi Plot, and it was in these sittings that Peter Wentworth began his activities.<sup>111</sup> This issue led to a continuity of parliamentary policy and an increase in the smoothness of parliamentary technique, so that Wentworth's work seems a half-way point between the comparatively haphazard activities of Hales and the Puritan machine of Coke's time.

Both Wentworth's and Hales's religious faith bound together their common interests in parliamentary privilege and desires for a Protestant monarch. After the death of Mary Stuart, Wentworth, like his predecessor, turned to the succession question with great vigor and published a tract.<sup>112</sup> The whole effort of the Puritans was centered in this fight, and they used their parliamentary power to the full. When Wentworth was imprisoned in 1592, the new power in religion and government seemed to have been smashed, but the ideals and techniques of the Elizabethan Puritan parliamentarians lived on in their Jacobean successors.

109 In 1565, both the Scotch and Spanish ambassadors wanted a copy of Hales's book in order to refute it, *Spanish Papers*, I, 424-425. In 1569, Bishop Leslie of Ross was permitted to answer it in *A defence of the honour of the . . . Princesse Marie* (London, 1569). Walsingham's activities are shown in Conyers Read, *Mr. Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen Elizabeth* (3 vols.; Cambridge, Mass., 1925), I, 14-16, 21-22, 60-74. Sidney's work is described by Martin A. S. Hume, *The Courtships of Queen Elizabeth* (New York, 1904), 218-219.

110 Neale, "Parliament and Succession," 498 and 507.

111 Sir Simonds D'Ewes, *A Compleat Journal of the votes, speeches, and debates, both of the House of Lords and the House of commons . . .* (2nd Ed.; London, 1693), 158, 159, 242. J. E. Neale, "Peter Wentworth," *English Historical Review*, XXXIX, (Jan. and April, 1924), 41-47, 175-176.

112 *A Pithie Exhortation to Her Maiestie for establishing her Successor to the Crowne. Whereunto is added a discourse containing the author's opinion of the true and lawfull successor to Her Maiestie* (Edinburgh, 1598).

## BOOK REVIEWS

### AN INTRODUCTION TO PHILO JUDAEUS

By ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940. xii, 223 pages. \$2.75.

This book will be welcomed by all students of Philo and especially by those who have found their interest in Philo stimulated and furthered by Professor Goodenough's particular approach. The greatest value of the book is in its nature as an introduction, for Professor Goodenough effectively and efficiently does what every student of Philo needs to have done for him; namely, he leads the student into the writings of Philo in the order from the simple to the complex and thus enables the student to master the difficult content of Philo's writings and at the same time to perceive the progress toward the understanding of the most difficult of the writings by perceiving the operation of Philo's allegorical method. The book as an introduction properly begins with a statement of method in which Goodenough, with his usual candor, places his own method beside those of the scholars whose approach differs from his own. Goodenough then proceeds to a brief survey of Philo's writings, and from these to the consideration of Philo's thought. The little that can be learned of Philo's life is thus gleaned from the writings, and this little becomes the more when Philo's accomplishments as a political and religious leader and as a thinker are placed against the background of his situation and time.

While Goodenough's treatment of Philo in this book is in line with his previous studies, the treatment is entirely objective. Thus this book is in no sense a propaganda study. Indeed, it is of all the greater value that it relates to Goodenough's previous work.

The scholarly world owes Professor Goodenough a great debt for this fresh approach, and even though some discount of his generalizations needs to be made, as Belkin's recent book seems to require, there is no doubt that Professor Goodenough has made an enduring contribution to Philonic studies. The present book brilliantly adds to this contribution and increases our debt.

University of Chicago.

Donald W. Riddle.

### JEWISH PROSELYTING IN THE FIRST FIVE CENTURIES OF THE COMMON ERA

#### THE AGE OF THE TANNAIM AND AMORAIM

By WILLIAM G. BRAUDE. Providence, R. I.: Brown University, 1940. viii, 142 pages. \$2.50

William G. Braude, lecturer at Brown University, herewith presents a valuable collection of the statements of the rabbis of the age of the Tan-

naim and Amaraim on proselytes to Judaism. This is a book which certainly ought to have been written. Its particular value for Christian readers is that it conveniently places before them these statements of the Jewish religious leaders with which they are to a large extent unacquainted, and which thus serve as a corrective of the common Christian conception of proselyting by the Jews. This common Christian conception, chiefly derived from Matthew 23:15, obviously requires correction. Braude shows that there was, particularly in the period which he covers, a persistent and a consistent maintenance of proselyting propaganda, and he makes clear that this effort was the natural outcome of the high sense of value in the Jewish conception of the oneness of God. Naturally, therefore, the proselyting effort is seen as the proper operation of late Judaism as a living religion.

With apparent competence in handling the difficult Jewish sources Braude analyzes and brings under the proper headings all of the aspects of Jewish law as it affected this class of persons. The picture which one obtains from such a review of the data is a pleasant one, and this study should be extremely useful to students of the history of religion in the period with which it deals.

University of Chicago.

Donald W. Riddle.

#### CHRONICLE OF JOHN MALALAS, BOOKS VIII-XVIII

Translated and edited by MATTHEW SPINKA in collaboration with GLANVILLE DOWNEY. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1940. xi, 150 pages. \$1.50.

Among the literary products of the period of Justinian there is a curious piece known as the *Chronicle* of John Malalas. It begins with the mythical history of Egypt and ends with the year 563. About the author himself very little is known; he was a hellenized Syrian, a native of Antioch, and a rhetor in the church. Hardly educated himself, he wrote for the uneducated public which might seek amusement in the reading of history. His work lacks proportion, important and insignificant events being related with the same seriousness; also, there are many and glaring inaccuracies.

Despite these limitations, however, the *Chronicle* of John Malalas is of considerable importance for several reasons. It is important for its linguistic value, for it is the first document of some length written in the vernacular Greek, the language spoken by the masses; it is useful as a historical source for the reigns of Anastasius, Justin, and Justinian, of whom the author was a contemporary; and it is significant for its influence on Byzantine chronography in general. The *Chronicle* of Malalas became a kind of standard for the later chronographers; it was extensively copied and seems even to have been continued at least down to the middle of the ninth century.

The influence of the *Chronicle* of Malalas extended beyond the scope of Byzantine chronography; it was translated into Slavonic and became the



prototype of Slavonic chronographers. The first Slavonic version seems to have been made in the tenth century and while it has been lost, fragmentary adaptations of it have survived, preserved in the two codices known as the Vilna and Archive manuscripts, and in the so-called Hellenic and Roman Annalists. These fragments have been arranged and edited by V. M. Istrin.

Istrin's edition, carefully checked and collated with the Greek version, has now been made available in the English by Professor Matthew Spinka and Dr. Glanville Downey, the former doing the actual work of translating while the latter that of checking and collating with the Greek original. Both authors were well qualified for their respective task, for Professor Spinka is a known Slavist, while Dr. Downey is thoroughly acquainted with the Greek original. The translation is not complete. It begins with book VIII, in which the founding of Antioch is described, for it was done at the request of the Department of Art and Archaeology of Princeton University, especially interested in Antioch to which there are numerous allusions in Malalas. The work includes an exhaustive bibliography which was compiled by Dr. Downey. It may be well to point out here that a new edition of the Greek version of Malalas is needed.

Rutgers University.

Peter Charanis.

#### CRITICISM OF THE CRUSADE

By PALMER A. THROOP. Amsterdam: Swets and Zeitlinger, 1940. xvi, 291 pages.

This very interesting book reveals how much criticism the Crusades elicited in their own day for quite varied reasons and from people in diverse walks of life, writing now in Latin, now in the vernaculars. Criticism was levelled at the conduct of the Crusades by those who believed in the ideal, but were shocked that criminals and heretics should be condemned to perpetual service in the Holy Land, thus corrupting alike the military and the moral quality of the enterprise. It would be better to establish a permanent mercenary force to guard the Sepulchre and to call on the majority in the West only for monetary contributions. Others, however, were incensed by the manner of raising money through the sale of indulgences. Some were incredulous of their efficacy. Even greater was the indignation over the redemption of crusading vows by money payments, when even the decrepit were induced to take the cross in order that they might be released from the obligation in return for a contribution.

Another storm arose when the crusading idea was diverted from the attack on the Saracens to conflicts with the Slavs, Albigenses, or the Hohenstaufen. The Albigensian Crusade was particularly unpopular because orthodox zeal against the heretics was merged with French rapacity for the lands of Provence.

Then there were the "Flemish cows staked out to graze," who preferred to stay at home and would undertake no war save one of defense. If the Saracens invaded Europe they might be resisted, but they were not

to be digged out of their burrows. The troubadors similarly detested any disturbance of their amours. Cynical spirits began to jibe at God for stirring up Crusades while enjoying for Himself the immunity of Heaven.

Finally, there came disillusionment over crusading itself whatever the objective. Repeated failures were taken to indicate that God Himself could not be too enthusiastic over the endeavor. At first reverses were explained as divine chastisements for the sins of the participants, but when even Saint Louis was unsuccessful, a doubt arose with regard to the whole method of constraint, especially if its object were to convert the infidel. And apart from disillusionment, the missionary pacifists like Roger Bacon always strenuously urged that persuasion alone is an appropriate means for the propagation of the faith.

Mr. Throop has put us all in his debt by his collection and analysis of a vast body of material difficult of access. And now war, alas, makes copies of his book for the time being difficult to obtain.

Yale University.

Roland H. Bainton.

#### THE STEPS OF HUMILITY BY BERNARD ABBOT OF CLAIRVAUX

Translated with Introduction and Notes, as a Study of his Epistemology, by GEORGE BOSWORTH BURCH. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1940. vii, 287 pages. \$3.00.

Though published in one volume this book is in reality two separate works. The first part, the Introduction, is the substance of a recent Harvard doctoral dissertation, "The Epistemology of St. Bernard of Clairvaux." The second part is the translation, with notes and two appendices, of St. Bernard's *De Gradibus Humilitatis*. The connection between these two parts is not as clear as it might be, though undoubtedly there is much epistemology which may be discerned in and between the lines of the mystical treatise on humility.

The Introduction is divided into three parts: The Subject of Knowledge, The Object of Knowledge, and The Method of Knowledge. Dr. Burch's method is the obvious one. Divisions and subdivisions of each of the three principal parts of the subject are delimited and proof-texts from the authentic works of Bernard are translated or paraphrased into a perhaps too-neat treatment. The footnotes are copious and help the reader to see that sometimes there is little connection between the paraphrase and the text upon which it is ostensibly based. The rendering of the Latin text is sometimes inaccurate, sometimes only awkward. The first sentence of the text reads: "The subject of knowledge is the monk." The proof-text is: "*Munda cor, exoccupa te ex omnibus, esto monachus, id est singularis . . .*" But to use "the monk" as a translation of "*monachus, id est singularis*" without some qualification which would indicate that the translator realized that Bernard was reproducing a familiar Latin gloss of a word he knew to be Greek is quite inadequate. Bernard had here, in all probability, no reference to the *religiosus vivens secundum regulam*. But "monk" means

in English just that. "Preventing grace" does not translate "*gratia praeveniens*." In general the method of selective paraphrase does not lend itself to a graceful style, nor does it avoid the pitfalls of misrepresenting the living thought of a living man. Almost anything can be proved by this method.

This procedure, of using "proof-texts" from many and various works, raises questions as to when these works were composed. Bernard's ideas developed in the course of his life, and the reader has a right to know if Bernard himself would have said in 1150 what he said in 1127. There is almost no indication throughout the work that Dr. Burch is aware of the possibility that to put together two or three statements made over a period of a quarter of a century might completely misrepresent the thought of an author at any given period of his life. It seems to the reviewer that Bernard might easily have difficulty in recognizing himself in the resultant exposition of his thought. There is no real effort made to connect Bernard either with his predecessors or contemporaries. Bernard would have been the first to disclaim originality, and the reader would wish to have him fixed in either the Platonic, the Augustinian, the pseudo-Dionysian, or the Anselmic tradition, or, perhaps better, show wherein he was indebted to any or all of them for his thought and to the *Organon* of Aristotle for his method of presentation.

The translation of *The Steps of Humility* is in general adequate, though here and there the student familiar with scholastic philosophical terminology will remark upon certain peculiarities which call for clarification. The doubt may also arise as to the need for a new translation when so recently as 1929 the S. P. C. K. published an English translation of this same work by B. R. V. Mills.

There are two appendices which treat minor questions in dispute with some competence but they could very well have appeared in the main treatment if it had been more usefully organized.

University of Colorado.

S. Harrison Thomson.

### THE MONASTIC ORDER OF ENGLAND

A HISTORY OF ITS DEVELOPMENT FROM THE TIMES OF SAINT DUNSTAN  
TO THE FOURTH LATERAN COUNCIL, 943-1216

By DOM DAVID KNOWLES. London: Cambridge University Press, 1940.  
xxli, 764 pages. \$9.50.

This is an ample and authoritative account of monasticism in England from the age of St. Dunstan to the reign of John, by a Benedictine who is also a competent historian. The author's vivid realization of the ideals of early Benedictinism is revealed in an introductory section which begins with a valuable interpretation of the *Rule*. Here he necessarily covers debated ground. On the question of manual work he favors the position of Abbot Butler against the negative view of Dom Chapman.

The book is in two main parts, called "Historical" and "Institutional." Part I in twenty chapters weaves a narrative of events; Part II describes and interprets the ordered life in the monasteries. A short concluding chapter sums up the main findings and emphasizes that rest in the author's mind when he has sifted the mass of data.

Dom Knowles reverts from the tendency of recent studies to the older view that true monasticism was extinct in England in the reign of Athelstan. He prints a short appendix giving contemporary statements in corroboration, and another related to the point on the status of Glastonbury in Dunstan's youth. The continental elements that entered into the work of Dunstan and his associates, especially from contacts with Ghent and Fleury, are carefully appraised, and the revival is represented as based upon "the normal use of western Europe." The library of Glastonbury, however, may have provided the reformers with the *Rule* itself and with the *Ordo qualiter* which—embodying "a use common to all the West"—is employed in the *Concordia Regularis* (ca. 970), the fundamental code of the movement. The importance of the revival was not that it produced any new form of monasticism, but that it planted Benedictinism again in England. Thereafter to the Norman Conquest, no foreign influence is traceable.

In order to give us a realization of the changes wrought in English monasticism by the Conquest, Dom Knowles treats at some length the personalities and forces in eleventh century Norman monasticism. The great Norman houses, under the lead of William of Dijon, nourished a remarkably vigorous monasticism which was more intellectualistic than that of Cluny, while it was also unified by a strict dependence on the feudal ruler. In England, Lanfranc was the able instrument of the Conqueror's policy of co-ordination, and labored to replace the now rather lax English by the efficient, moderately ascetic, and studious Norman monastic life. The Norman abbots appointed to English houses were "able and exemplary" as a group; but the author recognizes three exceptions, of whom Thurstan is doubtless the most notorious. It is, perhaps, Dom Knowles's scholarly distaste for overstatement that makes him describe Thurstan's murderous assault upon his monks for their refusal to sing the Norman chant merely as "unreasonable, if not brutal."

The description of Cluniac organization is of a loosely knit body, with head and members related as in feudalism and without a scientific constitution, in which discipline depended on unremitting liturgical activity. In England, the Cluniac houses were largely beyond the direct government of the abbots of Cluny, and obligated instead to their founding houses and to their hereditary patrons. They were too small to reproduce the ceremonial splendor of Cluny, and they lacked governmental co-ordination.

The Continental background is clarified also in the treatment of the Cistercians and of the other new orders which gained a footing in England during the twelfth century. The statement that before the conversion of Bernard "the collapse of Cîteaux seemed inevitable and imminent" appears a little extreme. In a careful account of the Cistercian constitution Dom Knowles remarks: "Hitherto, outside of Cluny, the only bond of discipline between monasteries had been the temporary and personal au-

thority of a reformer." This should be read in the light of his previous references to the effective co-ordination brought about by the policies of temporal rulers, especially of the Norman dukes. It is to be remembered too, that the official adoption under Louis the Pious (817) of the one "*salubris consuetudo*" of Benedict of Aniane surely established "a bond of discipline" beyond the reformer's "personal authority."

By most readers Part II will be voted the better half of the book. Its seventeen chapters are grouped under five heads: the interior polity of the Black Monks; the work and influence of the monks; the external relations of the monastery; the White Monks, and monastic discipline. It is not too much to say that in his treatment of these topics Dom Knowles excels in grasp of detail and lucidity of exposition all preceding historians of English monastic institutions. One sees why in his preface, while paying his respects to recent scholarship, he rightly regards the now antiquated but never negligible Fosbroke as his leading predecessor. A marked moderation of judgment is everywhere apparent. Dom Knowles is sparing both of praise and blame. He charges with prejudice and exaggeration such critics of the monks as Gerald of Wales and Walter Map; but he avoids all rhapsodical laudation of monastic fervor and discipline. He warns against the "siren voice of romanticism," "that old enchantress," whose spells have been laid upon too many writers sympathetic with monasticism. The work is quite as widely removed in point of view from that of Gasquet or Montalembert as it is from that of Coulton or Baskerville. Matters of the spiritual life find, indeed, little place, since monks of the period left no treatises on it. No greater importance is attached to their work of intercession: "the reception of a wealthy *confrater* . . . usually implied a legacy." Their hospitality and works of mercy are given more stress, but modestly reported. We are presented with an intimate moving picture of the development and functioning of monastic institutions. There is much of litigation over properties and privileges; fraud is minimized, but we see plenty of evidence of greed and ambition, and many instances of the relaxation of discipline. We read of a monk who plotted the murder of his abbot and of *conversi* who stole their abbot's horses in revenge for his prohibition of beer. While Dom Knowles does not shrink from presenting facts of this sort and does not argue them away, he nevertheless cultivates the impression that the core of the system was sound.

It is estimated that monks and canons numbered "between one and two per cent of the adult males of England," and that they held an increasing share of the nation's wealth, which reached a quarter or a third of the total. But even in the age of rapid growth after the Conquest, they yielded their exclusive place of leadership to the secular organizations of feudalism, to the papacy, and to the "new and lettered hierarchy." The latter, as is shown in some detail in Part I, at the end of the period stoutly contended against monastic claims.

The book is written in smooth, restrained, scholarly prose. It will undoubtedly take a place among the leading works to be consulted by students of the period, and for English monastic history it becomes at once indispensable.

The University of Chicago.

John T. McNeill.



## STUDIES IN MEDIEVAL GERMAN JEWISH HISTORY

By BERTHOLD ALTMANN. New York: Reprinted from the *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, 1940. 94 pages.

The causes for the change in status which the Jews of western Europe underwent during the Middle Ages have of late become the subject of considerable discussion. Free, respected, and privileged as late as the eleventh century, the Jews are found to have been reduced to serfdom by the thirteenth century and to utter rightlessness during the fourteenth. Dr. Altman attempts to indicate the steps in this transformation within Germany, with the city of Regensburg as the outstanding example. In a closely reasoned and amply documented argument, he suggests that the crucial element in the situation was the growth to self-conscious power of the medieval town and its struggle for autonomy. Originally, personal and property rights had been granted to Jewish trading centers. Eventually, Christian communities grew up near by, with equal personal and corporate rights. As these Christian communities grew in size and power, they sought to extend their territorial and jurisdictional control. The need of the Jews for defense against the danger of murderous attack from the outside, during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, forced them to give up their rights in exchange for protection. First they surrendered to the Emperor their status as free citizens, and became *servi camerae*. A century later they submitted to the authority of the burghers, yielding to the city's demands for the right to tax the Jews and to interfere in other matters. In the course of this argument, the author propounds a change in the theory regarding the process by which the *servi camerae* status came into being.

The monograph is interesting and suggestive, even though it is occasionally unnecessarily complicated by the author's wandering too far afield in order to refute the theories of others. To connect the fate of the Jewish communities with their neighboring Gentile communities is a fruitful idea. More communities will have to be studied, however, before the steps outlined by Dr. Altmann can be accepted as having formed the usual process. Dr. Altmann's study is concerned with the legal status; he has comparatively little to say about the economic movements which underlay the changes he describes.

More important than the actual historical analysis are the sources which the author uses and the method which he applies to them. In order to shed more light on the development of the Jewish status, he considers the changes in the legal status of another corporate minority within the city, namely the clergy. The encroachments of the city council, for example, on the local authority of the clergy paralleled the methods used in the case of the Jews. Equally stimulating is Dr. Altmann's use of rabbinic *responsa*. This source of information about the status of the Jews has been practically neglected. *Responsa* have often been used by students of social theology and law; occasionally, in more recent years, by students of social and economic life. The fact that the *responsa* are written in rather difficult Hebrew and consist, in large part, of abstruse legal argumentation, has militated against their being used even by many Jewish historians. For-

unately, this situation is improving. In time, other monographs, like this one of Dr. Altmann's will reveal much information on Jewish and general history drawn from this hitherto little used material.

The Gratz College, Philadelphia, Pa.

Solomon Grayzel.

#### PAPAL ENFORCEMENT OF SOME MEDIEVAL MARRIAGE LAWS

By CHARLES EDWARD SMITH. University, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1940. vii, 230 pages. \$2.50.

The first three chapters survey the development of the law of impediments to marriage under the captions of consanguinity, affinity, public honesty, and spiritual relationship. They begin with the background in Roman law and summarize conciliar canons and papal decrees to 1303. They also explain the method of calculating degrees of relationship and describe briefly the procedure in matrimonial causes, utilizing for these purposes the opinions of contemporary canonists and theologians as well as the law itself.

The manner in which the papacy enforced these laws during the same period is established by a study of cases taken in chronological order. The famous cases of Lothaire II, Robert the Pious, Phillip I, and Phillip Augustus are treated with much detail derived from independent study of original sources. Less well-known cases receive due attention in their proper chronological positions. The result is a clear picture of the growth of papal power and practice in the administration of this field of law.

The final chapters trace the history of papal grants of dispensation from these legal impediments to marriage. They are of importance chiefly for the thirteenth century, when the greater abundance of documents provided by the papal registers enables the author to deduce the reasons which governed the curial practice in the issue of such dispensations.

The different portions of the work vary somewhat in value. The first section does not contain as much new material as the others, but provides a concise summary of a difficult subject. The main theme, the papal enforcement of the laws, is developed comprehensively, and the analysis of papal relaxations of the laws also makes a significant contribution to our knowledge. The book will be a great convenience to students of this phase of papal activity.

Haverford College.

W. E. Lunt.

#### THE BORGIA POPE: ALEXANDER VI

By ORESTES FERRARA. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1940. 455 pages. \$3.50.

This book proves again the historian's principle that wherever there is smoke there is not necessarily a fire. In the case of Alexander VI one may say that the author has shown that the vast volume of smoke was not caused by a commensurately big fire. Mr. Ferrara has not attempted a whitewash

of the Borgia pope. He allows that as an individual and as a man of his times, Alexander might very well have had his life after the flesh. But his thesis is that practically none of it can be proved from reliable documents. Thus his cohabitation with Vanozza is questioned, as also the allegation that he was the father of Cesar, Giovanni, Jofre, and Lucretia. Stories of incest and wholesale poisonings are altogether discredited. The tale of his inviting Charles VIII to Italy are called a libel.

The author supplies motives for the Pope's evil reputation. Among the more important are his Spanish blood and his realistic program of making his vassals of the papal states acknowledge their master. The claim is made that there is no rumor concerning Alexander's exceptional wickedness until he is a man of sixty. Even then the sole authority for rumor is "they say" or "it is commonly known." Not until after the Pope died did his reprobate character become a certainty; "they say" had become "it happened."

Mr. Ferrara has submitted to critical examination only part of the documentary evidence against Alexander. He handles it largely as a counsel for defense would in court. At the end one feels that the evidence is not strong enough for complete conviction. Then one turns to von Pastor and feels that the case is still open. The learned counsel spends too much time refuting von Ranke and Gregorovius; a good deal of what these accepted was later upset by von Pastor. By the time of Symonds the story of the death of Alexander as due to poison prepared for others was already discounted by reputable historians. The reader cannot help feeling that the case is not proved.

Yet there is virtue in opening up the matter again. After centuries of loose talk about the Renaissance popes it is such books as this one that set a seal upon the lips. *De mortuis nil nisi bonum* still should prevail unless evidence is indisputably to the contrary.

University of Oregon.

Quirinus Breen.

### IGNATIUS HIS CONCLAVE

BY JOHN DONNE

Edited by CHARLES COFFIN. New York: Columbia University Press (for the Facsimile Text Society), 1941. xiii, 180 pages. \$1.60.

This is a facsimile reproduction of the edition of 1611, prepared by Charles M. Coffin, who prefaces it with an Introduction. The work itself is a bitter diatribe against Ignatius Loyola and the Jesuit Order in general which reminds one strongly of Pascal's *Provincial Letters*, published forty-five years later. The scene is laid in hell, where Ignatius disputes with a number of worthies—Machiavelli among the rest—for the favor of Lucifer. Strong, denunciatory language, redolent with crude aspersions upon the papacy and the Company of Jesus, characterizes this would-be "satire." It is somewhat difficult to visualize the future Dean of St. Paul as the author of this work.

The Chicago Theological Seminary.

Matthew Spinka.

### THE BEGINNINGS OF METHODISM IN ENGLAND AND IN AMERICA

By FRANCIS H. TEES. Nashville: The Parthenon Press, 1940. 225 pages. \$1.00.

The pastor of Old St. George's Church, Philadelphia, the oldest continuing church in American Methodism, had access to valuable source material. These were found in the archives of his own church as well as in the Philadelphia Conference Historical Society collection. Among the latter is the invaluable document, the manuscript Journal of Joseph Pilmoor, one of the missionaries sent by Wesley to America. The author has taken great pains not to out-distance his supporting factual material. Allowing these ancient documents frequently to speak for themselves makes this volume in many respects a reference source book. The survey of the manifold expressions of the movement in England is a model of clarity and condensation, although rather cursory and sketchy at times. In the American phase (chaps. iv-xvi) we have a presentation which every future historian must consult. The question of the priority of Methodism's introduction into this country the author appears to decide in favor of the southern or Maryland theory by a margin of about two years as against the advocates of the New York origins. In view of all that has been written on this matter, however, this problem still remains because of the lack of adequate documentary evidence (for the southern theory).

A few strictures may be permitted. The reader must not expect a history after the manner of Bancroft or Parkman. Breaks occur in the story, and lack of organization produces gaps which a fertile historical imagination might have bridged. One is at loss whether to be grateful for the great wealth of quoted sources or whether to deplore the author's dearth of interpreting skill. There is no index. However, pictures of old church buildings and individuals as well as facsimiles of old sources enhance the value of the book.

Garrett Biblical Institute,  
Evanston, Ill.

A. W. Nagler.

### SIMEON AND CHURCH ORDER

By CHARLES SMYTH. Cambridge: at the University Press; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941. 312 pages. \$4.00.

This learned and discriminating book consists of six independent but related essays on various phases of the origins of the Evangelical Revival in Cambridge. It is important for four reasons. The first three essays cast light on the state of religion in the home, the school, and the University. The last three discuss ably what the author regards as the two chief problems confronting Evangelicals; namely, how to secure continuity of Evangelical teaching in parishes under the patronage system, and what attitude to take toward church discipline, especially that phase of it which forbade preaching in a parish without the consent of its vicar. The fourth and fifth contain excellent sketches of two Evangelicals, far too

little known, Berridge of Everton and Cadogan of Reading. The first and last essays contend that Simeon was the chief statesman among the Evangelicals and that his influence was what kept many of them from leaving the Established Church.

With the author's estimate of Simeon's importance I am in hearty accord, and also with his judgment about the importance of the two Evangelical problems he concentrates on. I am not wholly satisfied with the book on several counts. It is regrettable that, after briefly mentioning the Simeon Trust as the way in which Simeon tried to secure continuity of teaching in parishes and questioning whether this device did not become a lamentable precedent in later days, the author failed to discuss the long range effect of the Trust. It is also regrettable that he shows so little appreciation of the genius of the Scottish Kirk in the last essay. Furthermore, I should be inclined to regard a third problem as being quite as important for the Evangelicals as the two Smyth stresses: how to organize the newly aroused devotion to Christ and to direct it into relevant activities. In helping answer this question (by the part he played in the C. M. S. and other Societies, by organizing relief during a famine, etc.), Simeon displayed his statesmanship as notably as in contributing to the solution of the other two. And lastly, I wish the author had gone farther into the factors that kept many Evangelicals in the Establishment. He stresses rightly the Prayer Book and the feeling for order bred into them and their forebears. I suspect two other motives were very important: the hold the Church had upon them not only as Church but also as an institution inextricably intertwined with much that was most precious in English history; and the strategic reason that if the Church were really awakened it had better chance of converting England than Dissent.

Virginia Theological Seminary,  
Alexandria, Va.

A. C. Zabriskie.

#### ROBERT DALE OWEN: A BIOGRAPHY

By RICHARD WILLIAM LEOPOLD. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1940. xiii, 470 pages. \$4.50.

Social history in the United States, long since little more than a name, has been making real progress of late. More and more historians are directing young scholars in that direction, with the result that solid contributions are coming from the press in steadily increasing numbers. Economic determinism, which has so long dominated the writing of American history, is giving way to a growing conviction that something more than politics and economics must be taken into consideration if American life is to be fully portrayed. This handsome volume is a product of this growing interest in social history and serves as a good example of what needs to be done if this emphasis is to be adequately undergirded. Social history must be based to a large degree on biography, for social history means an enlarged emphasis upon the history of ideas, and ideas are the offspring of personalities.

A biography of Robert Dale Owen has been long overdue, not only



because of the important place he holds in the history of reform, but also because of his significance as an intellectual, religious, and literary figure. For more than forty years his was a figure of national prominence. His first fame was gained as a radical reformer and a religious liberal; his middle years were devoted to politics in his adopted state of Indiana and in the nation. He served the country during the Civil War on important commissions, and helped shape public opinion on emancipation and reconstruction, through a series of important publications. His latter years were devoted to the study of propaganda of spiritualism.

The story of New Harmony on the lower Wabash in Indiana is as strange a bit of history as is to be found in that strange period of the thirties and forties. Designed by Robert Owen, the wealthy mill owner of New Lanark, Scotland, as an experiment in communal living, it proved, within sixteen months, a dismal failure. His eldest son, Robert Dale Owen, entered into the scheme with an optimism equal to that of his father. The site had been purchased from a communistic sect, the Rappites, for more than \$100,000. The Rappites had within twenty-five years developed it from nothing into a thriving community. The contrast between the Owen failure and the Rappite success at New Harmony brings out in clear relief the difference in the types of people which composed the two communities as well as the dominant ideas of each. Religion was the unifying factor among the Rappites; the Owenites rejected religion and advocated radical economic and social reform. Jacob Rapp was the revered and recognized leader among the Harmonists; no one was the recognized leader among the Owenites. Nor was there any unified program of reform. The ending of the New Harmony experiment left Robert Owen with most of his fortune gone, while the land he had purchased in and around New Harmony was the only patrimony he left to his two sons and daughter. This tied Robert Dale Owen to Indiana, while the reform in education of women's rights, which had been a part of the New Harmony program of reform, gave him definite causes to advocate on his entrance into Indiana politics in 1836.

Robert Dale Owen's religious views were always at variance with accepted orthodoxy. For a number of years following the New Harmony fiasco he devoted himself to free-thought journalism and lecturing; after 1856 he became more and more interested in spiritualism, to which he soon became an avowed convert, though he never identified himself with any spiritualist organization. In his early life he had completely rejected all belief in a future life; in his later years he held that belief in immortality was a necessary prerequisite for all reformers. His spiritualism was distinctly Christian, holding that it was not a substitute for, but an ally of Christianity, and he did more to make it intellectually respectable than any other American has ever done. His two books, *Footfalls on the Boundary of Another World* (1860) and *The Debatable Land between this World and the Next* (1877), are more solidly based than any other spiritualist writings of his time. His religious views were always a handicap to his political advancement, and some of his most bitter political disappointments were evidently due to this cause. The wonder is that he succeeded in politics as well as he did in view of the overwhelming orthodoxy of American opinion of that time. That he did succeed in becoming an im-

portant political figure in the nation was due to his exceptional ability and disinterested devotion to a number of great and good causes to which he gave his support.

At the time of his death in 1877 the most influential newspaper in Indiana stated editorially:

In scholarship, general attainments, varied achievements, as author, statesman, politician, and leader of a new religious faith, he was unquestionably the most prominent man Indiana ever owned . . . No other Hoosier was ever so widely known, and no other has ever before held so prominent a place so long, with a history so unspotted with selfishness, duplicity, or injustice."

A careful reading of this scholarly biography will, I think, convince any fair minded student, that this estimate is not far wrong. Time has dimmed the luster of Robert Dale Owen's name, but the author's opinion is also that of this reviewer, that "his career is of interest and value to students of our political, social, economic, and religious history."

The University of Chicago.

William W. Sweet.

#### PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGES AND ACADEMIES IN NEBRASKA

By FRANK E. WEYER. Hastings, Nebraska: Democrat Printing Co., 1940.  
183 pages. \$1.50.

This careful study is the most recent example of the increasing literature concerned with Presbyterian educational history in the Mississippi Valley. The purpose of this volume, as stated in the introduction, is "to trace the various attempts of the Presbyterian Church to establish and to maintain secondary and higher educational institutions in Nebraska, from earliest territorial days to the present time; to determine what trends, if any, characterized the attitude of the Presbyterian Church toward education; and to consider the philosophy underlying" . . . "elementary schools and theological or technical institutions are not included in this study." (1.2).

These aims do not receive equal attention. The section which considers "the philosophy underlying" the "interest in education" among Presbyterians (18-38; 175-6), evidences, by sufficient documentation, adequate knowledge of competent literature on this phase of the subject. Frequent foot-notes invite attention to illustration or application of the denominational position in Nebraska situations. Conclusions reached concerning the educational motivations of the Presbyterians are in substantial agreement with those advanced by Dean C. Harve Geiger in his recent *Program of Higher Education of the Presbyterian Church of the U. S. A.* An understanding of this position is most helpful toward appreciation of the development that occurs in Nebraska.

In a second section (4-17), "the early Nebraska scene" is sketched, with "some attention" . . . "to the coming of the Presbyterian missionaries" (in 1834) and the later "establishment of the Church," as background to the "more significant factors that stand out in connection with the establishment and growth" of the five institutions that are included in the subject under consideration. This section discloses that numerous official and

unpublished documents of the various institutions and ecclesiastical bodies of Nebraska have been located, compared, and studied (39-107). Patient research in these sources adds much of freshness and value to the book.

The most valuable section of the book is entitled "A Survey of Personnel, Finance and Curriculum of Bellvue College and Hastings College" (108-171), "with a more detailed study given to the one College functioning today." Professor Weyer, as Dean of Hastings College, has had access to numerous original files of material. These he skillfully and carefully compiles, analyses, and evaluates. Upon these laborious compilations, his conclusions (172-183) are largely based. An adequate index adds much to the usefulness of his work. The bibliography is most suggestive, but adequate reference is missing to magazine and newspaper sources that are listed. It is regrettable that the study excluded Presbyterian theological education in Nebraska, for pages sixty-four and sixty-seven suggest that it has been an active factor in the story of Presbyterian higher educational history in Nebraska, and must yet receive more adequate consideration, if the story is to be complete. But to all concerned with Presbyterian educational history and heritage in the Middle West, this volume is a welcome contribution. It should encourage attention to the material it has uncovered, and stimulate investigation of the sources among which it has pioneered.

Presbyterian Theological Seminary,  
Omaha, Nebraska.

Francis L. Bouquet.

#### HAGIA SOPHIA

By EMERSON HOWLAND SWIFT. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940. xviii, 270 pages, illustrated. \$10.00.

The publication of this sumptuous edition of a scholarly work dealing with the history and the artistic and architectural features of the fourteen centuries old Cathedral of Saint Sophia of Constantinople is an event of importance. The author has evaluated the work of all former scholars in this field, and has contributed to it on the basis of his own original research.

After a chapter on the history of this great Byzantine church the author devotes the bulk of his work to a description of its artistic and architectural features, this being his chief purpose. Since the building has been recently converted from a mosque into a museum, work on the restoration of the original mosaics of the interior has been permitted, and is being vigorously carried on. This circumstance offers an opportunity for the study of this monument of Byzantine art and architecture such as has not existed since the Conquest. The book includes an exhaustive bibliography, listing some Russian and Bulgarian works, besides the Byzantine Greek works and books in various modern languages. Moreover, the book contains numerous plates and photographic illustrations which greatly enhance its value.

The interest of the church historian will undoubtedly center upon the chapter dealing with the history of the church. Although the author is a competent historian, there are a number of statements which lack in

exact accuracy. The final struggle between Constantine and Licinius occurred in 323 (not 324, p. 8). When Constantine chose the site of Byzantium for his new capital, he removed it from Nicomedia, not Rome, and the date is 325, not 326 (p. 8). To say that Justinian allowed Theodora "to interfere directly . . . in the government of the Empire" (p. 11) is hardly an accurate description, since she was crowned Empress in her own right. An error which mars the sense of a sentence is to be found on page 12, where the assertion is made that the cost of the outlay "amounted to £320,000, a total discredited by Gibbon, who, on grounds of probability, places the minimum at one million pounds sterling." In the first place, the 320,000 refers to pounds of gold used (not pounds sterling); and secondly, Gibbon does not "discredit" this assertion, but merely evaluates it at a million sterling, which amount "is the result of the lowest calculation."

But these slight inaccuracies do not materially affect the value of the work as a whole, which will undoubtedly take its place among the chief authoritative treatises on the subject.

The Chicago Theological Seminary.

Matthew Spinka.